

DEC 14 1932 306

# THE LOUISIANA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. 22, No. 4

OCTOBER, 1932

Early Economic Life in Louisiana, 1804-1820 (An Historical Dialogue), by Pierre de la Vergne.

A Collection of Louisiana Confederate Letters, Edited by Frank E. Vandiver.

The Political Career of Thomas Ogden Moore, Secretary of State of Louisiana, by Van D. Olson.

The Louisiana People's Party, by Louis Ellsworth Bartel.

Joseph Jefferson in New Orleans, by John Smith Kendall.

Book Reviews.

Notes to the Editors: The Social Thought of Louisiana, by Louis Ellsworth Bartel; The Louisiana Historical Quarterly, by Louis Ellsworth Bartel; The Louisiana Historical Quarterly, by Louis Ellsworth Bartel.

THE LOUISIANA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY  
PUBLISHED BY THE LOUISIANA HISTORICAL SOCIETY  
NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA



## NOTICE

### Louisiana Historical Society Publications

The following issues of the Society can be purchased at the prices listed, subject to fluctuation, plus ten cents per number for postage. Address Henry M. Gill, Corresponding Secretary, The Cabildo, Third Floor, Chartres and St. Peter Streets, New Orleans, Louisiana. All issues of the Society that you do not desire will be appreciated, as the Society needs duplications.

**Publications:** Volumes 1-10, complete set, bound \$25.00; each number \$1.00, except Vol. 2, Pts. 1 and 2, the stock of which is exhausted.

**Quarterlies:** Volumes 1-15, complete set, bound \$100.00; each number \$1.00, except Vol. 1, Nos. 3 and 4, \$4.00 each; Vol. 2, Nos. 1 and 4, stock exhausted, No. 3, \$4.00; Vol. 3, Nos. 1 and 4, stock exhausted, and Vol. 4, No. 4, \$4.00.

The Society has a few copies of the valuable works listed below which will be sold (while the supply lasts) at the prices named, plus postage and subject to fluctuation.

**History of Reconstruction in Louisiana**, by John R. Ficklen, \$2.50 (Cloth).

**History of the Battle of New Orleans, 1815**, compiled by Stanley A. Arthur, the Official Program, 1915, \$1.00.

**How the Louisiana Purchase was Financed**, by J. E. Winston and E. W. Columb, \$1.00 (Paper).

**A Criminal Trial Before the Superior Council of Louisiana, May, 1767**, by Henry P. Dart, \$1.00 (Paper).

**Henry Miller Shreve, A Biography**, by Caroline S. Pfaff, \$1.00 (Paper).

**Pages From A Journal of A Voyage Down the Mississippi in 1817**, edited by Felix Fingel, \$1.00 (Paper).

**Louisiana in The Disputed Election of 1876**, by Fanny E. Lovell Bona, \$1.00 (Paper).

**Slavery on Louisiana Sugar Plantations**, by V. Allen Moody, \$1.00 (Paper).

**Transfer of Louisiana from France to the United States, Official Documents Preserving**, edited by James H. Augushak, \$1.00 (Paper).

# THE LOUISIANA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. 26, No. 4

OCTOBER, 1943



Entered as Second Class mail matter June 6, 1917, at the post office at New Orleans, La.,  
under Act of August 24, 1912.

Subscription \$3.00 per annum, payable in advance. Address Louisiana Historical Quarterly,  
Cabildo, New Orleans, La.

**OFFICERS  
OF THE  
LOUISIANA HISTORICAL SOCIETY**

---

EDWARD ALEXANDER PARSONS, President.  
ANDRÉ LAFARGUE, First Vice-President.  
JAMES WILKINSON, Second Vice-President.  
FRANK H. WADDILL, Third Vice-President.  
J. FAIR HARDIN,\* Vice-President.  
    For North Louisiana.  
PROF. WILLIAM A. READ, Vice-President,  
    For Southern Louisiana.  
WM. BOIZELLE, Recording Secretary.  
HENRY M. GILL, Corresponding Secretary.  
WALTER PRICHARD, Editor.  
J. B. DONNES, Treasurer.

**Executive Committee**

EDWARD A. PARSONS, <i>Chairman.</i>	
ANDRÉ LAFARGUE	WALTER PRICHARD
JAMES WILKINSON	WM. BOIZELLE
FRANK H. WADDILL	HENRY M. GILL
J. B. DONNES	

**Editor Louisiana Historical Quarterly**

WALTER PRICHARD, Louisiana State University,  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

**Advisory Editorial Board**

JOHN S. KENDALL	J. FAIR HARDIN,* Shreveport.
JAMES E. WINSTON	R. W. COLOMB
GEORGE C. H. KERNION	FRANCIS P. BURNS
HENRY W. ROBINSON	ROBERT D. CALHOUN,* Vidalia, Louisiana

\* Deceased.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vol. 26, No. 4

OCTOBER, 1943

	PAGE
Early Economic Life in Louisiana, 1804-1824 (An Historical Dialogue), <i>by Pierre de la Vergne</i> .....	915
A Collection of Louisiana Confederate Letters, <i>edited by Frank E. Vandiver</i> .....	937
The Political Career of Thomas Overton Moore, Secession Governor of Louisiana, <i>by Van D. Odom</i> .....	975
The Louisiana People's Party, <i>by Lucia Elizabeth Daniel</i> .....	1055
Joseph Jefferson in New Orleans, <i>by John Smith Kendall</i> .....	1150
Book Reviews.....	1168
Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, LXXVIII, February-March, 1785. (Continued from July, 1943, Quarterly), <i>by Laura L. Porteous; Marginal Notes by Walter Prichard</i> .....	1187







# THE LOUISIANA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. 26, No. 4

OCTOBER, 1943

---

## EARLY ECONOMIC LIFE IN LOUISIANA, 1804-1824 (AN HISTORICAL DIALOGUE)\*

---

*By* PIERRE DE LA VERGNE

---

### FOREWORD

I ask my reader to turn back the pages of time and to walk with me through the streets of old New Orleans some one hundred and sixteen years ago. I ask that he should listen as I tell him of a fictitious conversation I overheard among some very distinguished gentlemen. These were none other than Edward Livingston, L. Moreau Lislet, Pierre Derbigny, Dr. Pierre A. Lambert, and Father Laplace, a young priest visiting the city. Their conversation had to do with the legislative solutions to the important political, economic, and sociological problems of the day—public control where such was needed—and their solutions as they appeared in the legislative acts of the Territory of Orleans and the State of Louisiana and the ordinances of the City of New Orleans from 1804 to 1824.

You see, it was as I was returning from the meeting of the Town Council, and, naturally, after such a drastic session you may well understand that I would have much food for thought. I wondered that such legislation should be passed, that so many people should be so restricted. Little would such provisions affect me, but as a legislator I pondered the consequences of such a law. And so it was, that as I was passing my accustomed coffee shop I noticed my friends Mr. Livingston and Mr. Moreau Lislet and others in a seemingly serious discussion. Attracting little attention, I paused to listen.

---

\* The substance of this article was presented to La Société de Droit Civil of the College of Law of Tulane University in the autumn of 1940. It was also read, in its present form, before the Louisiana Historical Society on April 29, 1941.

"...such laws as these have never before been resorted to in the history of the city. The restrictions are too great and too unreasonable—the life of this town will be choked by the very legislation that seeks so vainly to relieve it. Such powers were never intended to be placed in the hands of the Council. As for myself, I believe it beyond the provisions of the City Charter."

*Livingston*—Sir, I beg to differ. Our City Charter has granted our Mayor and the Council many powers, some general and others specific. As we know, the Mayor and Council have the power to regulate the service of persons employed in working fire engines; they have the right to permit or to forbid theaters, balls and other public amusements, to cause the playhouses and places of show or exhibition to be closed whenever the preservation of order, public safety or tranquility shall require it; they may establish market places and determine the mode and inspection for all comestibles sold publicly, either in said market or in other places; they also have been given the power to regulate everything which relates to bakers, butchers, tavern keepers or of grogshops, and other persons keeping public houses, draymen, horse drivers, water carriers, and slaves employed as day laborers. And in my mind the most important power is the right to fix the salaries of the draymen, horse drivers, water carriers and day laborers and to make any other regulations which may contribute to the better administration of the affairs of the City.<sup>1</sup> Thus the City did have the power to pass the ordinances in question. But I do agree with you, Sir, the result to follow does not seem favorable, though it may very well be.

*Moreau*—True, Mr. Livingston. But do you, of all people, sanction the vesting of such power in the City government, that is, the right to regulate wages and prices of commodities.

*Livingston*—You may well know I am not in favor of such broad powers. As you may remember, I was consulted in the drafting of the charter of the town of Monroe. At that time I suggested, which suggestion was accepted, a specific provision to the effect that no regulation of the town shall prescribe the price of any commodity or article of provision offered for sale in said town.<sup>2</sup> Such powers, with the growing development of trade and competition among the merchants, are no longer needed by the town councils.

<sup>1</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 2 Leg., 2 Sess. (1816), p. 92.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 Leg., 2 Sess. (1820), p. 60.

*Moreau*—So I conceived. But, I am sure that you could not object to the exercise of such powers by the Council as the fixing of the dimensions of the carts employed in carrying firewood within the city and suburbs, and that firewood should only be sold by the cord, half-cord, and quarter-cord.<sup>3</sup> Such regulations I would deem helpful both to the merchants and to the citizens.

*Livingston*—Quite true. Such a provision was both wise and beneficial. Such minor powers as these are essential to city government under their police power. In the same manner, the forbidding of the sale of oysters between the first of May and the first of October was very necessary.<sup>4</sup> Such regulations could only be wisely administered by the city police. The rules to be administered by the City should be of their own creation, when possible.

*Derbigny*—These matters, gentlemen, though at best they may ultimately involve a comprehensive theory of government, are, to my mind, rather insignificant. As for me, I find it very much more important that the physicians, surgeons and apothecaries have been brought under the control of our city and state governments.

*Dr. Pierre Lambert*—As a doctor of medicine, I quite agree with Mr. Derbigny. As early as 1804 there began to arrive and are still arriving in this city, individuals who are practicing medicine, surgery and pharmacy without authorization, so that many citizens are exposed to become victims of "empiricism" and "charlatanism" whose incalculable ravages are all the more destructive as they are masked by outward deception and allurements. When this was first brought to the attention of the municipal body it was ordered that all physicians, surgeons and pharmacists and others so-called, who had not obtained permission to practice in this city these several professions, should be compelled to have their diplomas registered with the municipal body. Those who did not possess diplomas were subject to an examination before a Health Committee composed of at least three physicians and two commissioners.<sup>5</sup>

*Derbigny*—But very much has been done since that date.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 2 Leg., 2 Sess. (1816), p. 16, relative to the sale of firewood. See also Ordinance of November 8, 1817, authorizing the republication of this Act because some questioned the right of the City to regulate the same. See Ordinances of August 26 and October 20, 1817, for greater detail on this point.

<sup>4</sup> Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved May 21, 1810.

<sup>5</sup> Minutes of the City Council of New Orleans, Session of June 20, 1804.



*Lambert*—Quite true. It was in 1808 that physicians, surgeons and apothecaries who wished to practice in the Territory had to prove their qualifications by means of their diploma of any university, as previously required. But, it was added that all should be publicly examined by a board of four of the oldest practitioners—regardless of the diploma.

Further, it was provided that any physician, surgeon or apothecary who should sell, or cause to be sold, remedies or drugs, which were at the time of the sale injured, moulded, decomposed or sophisticated, should be fined five hundred dollars.<sup>6</sup>

*Derbigny*—Another very wise provision was also made. Physicians, surgeons, or apothecaries could only sell suspicious or dangerous remedies to heads of families of good reputation. Application for such a remedy had to be in writing, stating the purpose for which the remedy was to be used. This written application was the only defense of the physician in the case of improper use of the remedy. If he was unable to produce the application he was deprived of the exercise of his profession and was made to forfeit one thousand dollars to the Charity Hospital.

*Lambert*—The need and importance of these regulations can only be fully appreciated by the older members of the community who were able to feel the influx of Americans in the Territory after the cession.

*Moreau*—You quite surprise me, Dr. Lambert, and I might say, you also please me, for I have heard many of your profession bitterly criticize these laws.

*Lambert*—Very true. There are certain stipulations that are unquestionably unwise. You see, it is provided that we doctors to exact a fee must state the exact date when the service was rendered, we must define clearly the name and characteristic symptoms of the disease, the detail of the remedy, the order in which the same were administered, how and with what the drugs were composed. The price of the drugs or remedies used are only allowable under such conditions.<sup>7</sup> Naturally, if in every case we were to conform to such provisions, obviously the difficulty would be appalling.

<sup>6</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 2 Leg., 1 Sess. (1808), Chapter VIII.

<sup>7</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 2 Leg., 2 Sess. (1816), p. 84, and 4 Leg., 2 Sess. (1820), p. 30, give details on this point.

*Moreau*—I have previously heard the same discussed. However, your professional brothers seem to complain more of their restrictions as regards compensation.

*Lambert*—Very true. I also disfavor these provisions. As you may know, when acting as a consulting physician we may charge four dollars for a verbal consultation made at the patient's home, plus the expense of the journey. When acting in the capacity of a family physician we are only allowed to charge for our visit. Visits made in the City are four bits each and in the suburbs one dollar, that is, when the physician does not live in the suburbs. Journeys in the country are charged at the rate of four bits per league. So, when you consider the items we are asked to consider in making our bills, you may well understand our misgivings as to the wisdom of our legislators. Needless to say, such mathematical exercises are seldom necessary. Such requirements have been placed to restrict the less ethical members of our profession.<sup>8</sup>

*Derbigny*—And perhaps it is because of our less ethical brothers, both in law and in medicine, that our professions have been classed, for taxing purposes, with retailers of merchandise and spirituous liquors, keepers of taverns and boardinghouses, owners and keepers of billiard tables, gaming houses and ball-rooms.<sup>9</sup>

*Moreau*—In this case I would prefer being orthodox in believing it to be a tax on a privilege, rather than a type of penance.

*Lambert*—Quite true. However, I must say you lawyers are as restricted as we doctors. Are you not?

*Livingston*—Our restrictions are similar, in many respects, to those of the physicians. In our case the applicant to the bar must exhibit a certificate, signed by a judge of the parish in which he has habitually resided for twelve months, stating that he is a man of good moral character, and that he is above the age of twenty-one years. Two judges of the Supreme Court are authorized to examine the applicant, and on qualifying, to grant him a license. Every attorney must show his license to practice, and take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. A five-hundred-dollar-fine is prescribed for every suit tried without a license.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 Leg., 2 Sess. (1820), p. 26.

<sup>10</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 2 Leg., 2 Sess. (1809), Chapter XXX.



*Lambert*—It is essential that men of both professions should possess certain qualifications.

*Livingston*—Similar to medicine, our fees have been rather closely regulated. Attorneys prosecuting or defending suits commenced and prosecuted in the superior or circuit courts at one time received sixteen dollars as compensation for all of their services, one dollar of which was to be paid to the court.<sup>11</sup> However, this sum was reduced to eleven dollars, including the court charge of one dollar.<sup>12</sup> Counsel's fee in the parish courts for similar services is five dollars.<sup>13</sup> And if a non-suit is entered due to the absence or neglect of an attorney without reasonable excuse, cost must be paid by the attorney, and he is liable to pay all the damages his client may suffer through this negligence.<sup>14</sup> These fees are, as you can readily understand, very often insignificant in proportion to the service rendered.

*Derbigny*—Mr. Livingston fails to mention that we attorneys are not entitled to a fee for services rendered in causes the amount whereof is below one hundred dollars.<sup>15</sup>

*Moreau*—Though I agree with Mr. Derbigny and Mr. Livingston, I do believe our plight is really not as bad as it might seem. Much revenue comes from our notarial work. Our fees for attesting all notarial acts within the preview of the laws of this state and affixing the seal is one dollar and fifty cents. And there are often many such acts. For making the same when required, we may charge for each one hundred words twenty-five cents, and for all copies with certificate, for each one hundred words twelve and one-half cents. Moreover, each time a notary is called out of his office for the purpose of passing any notarial act he may charge the double of his usual fee.<sup>16</sup> Thus, we lawyers who are notaries are often considerably aided by our notarial commissions.

*Lambert*—But even so, Mr. Moreau, I believe we must agree that our lawyers are rather closely watched.

*Derbigny*—However, it is well for us to remember that much of our regulatory laws are self-imposed. I have in mind, for

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter XVII.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter XXX.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter XVII.

<sup>16</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 1 Leg., 2 Sess. (1812-13), pp. 176-194. An Act to establish an explicit fee bill, approved March 28, 1813.

example, the rules prescribed for the bakers in 1804. At that time the bakers of the city were ordered to appear at the City Hall to deliberate upon the nature and the form of the regulations to be established upon their management and the obligations which were proper to impose upon them in order that the rights of the City and the interest of the public be not wronged. After fully discussing this, it was unanimously resolved that the bakers of this city would be compelled to declare in writing on the first of each month, at the City Hall, the number of barrels of flour purchased by them during the preceding month, from whom bought, those consumed the said month, and the number remaining on hand, under a penalty of four dollars for failure to make this declaration on the second day of each month. They agreed to stamp their bread with the mark that they themselves may choose to use. And it was agreed that loaves must have the exact weight as fixed by the Municipal Council every Saturday of each week, under penalty of fifty dollars and the confiscation of loaves that are not of the proper weight, for the benefit of the Hospital of the Poor. Later the weights and the prices were determined. The bakers of the city were called into the session hall where the Secretary of the Municipality read to them the above resolution which they heard and promised before us, with uplifted hand, to faithfully execute in every detail.<sup>17</sup> Thus, when our laws are brought to task, and when we have misgivings as to our legislators or our Council, we should well remember that many of the laws that affect our business or our trade were at one time agreed upon by our associates as means both of protecting the public and aiding in the advancement of our business.

*Lambert.*—Since that day of which you speak, I understand that flour, as well as beef and pork, has been subject to greater supervision. It seems that no owner of flour, beef or pork can offer the same for sale until his stuff has been inspected by the city, which makes me very happy, as the meat in New Orleans has been consistently bad and has caused much sickness. There are still many cases of ptomaine poisoning in the city, but as all meats which are found by the inspector to be tainted, spoiled, or unfit for market are to be destroyed, the number of cases should be greatly reduced.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Minutes of the City Council of New Orleans, Session of February 8, 1804. On the inspection of bread, see Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved April 1, 1817.

<sup>18</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 1 Sess. (1804-05), Chapter XLV. An Act regulating the inspection of flour, beef and pork, approved May 3, 1805.

*Derbigny*—The council has tried in many ways to raise the sanitary standards of the meat market. It has been provided that for conveying butcher's meat from the slaughterhouse to the public market, the meat must be laid in none but covered carts specially appropriated for that use. These carts are supposed to be kept constantly clean on penalty of a fine of five dollars for every offence. If a driver or any other person be found sitting on the meat laid in any of the carts, the offender is to pay a fine of three dollars if he is a free man, and if he is a slave, he is to receive fifteen lashes. However, this provision was greatly weakened by allowing butcher's meat to be conveyed to market in wheelbarrows.<sup>19</sup>

*Livingston*—It was expressly prohibited to expose to sale any animal that died of distemper, or measly or mangy, or to vend the meat thereof. In order to prevent this abuse, the warden of the market, together with two experienced butchers, chosen by the Mayor and sworn before him, are daily, on the opening of the market, to make a strict inspection of the butcher's meat, poultry, game and fish exposed to sale; and the warden is to seize all meat declared to be unwholesome by the said inspectors, and to cause the same to be buried or thrown in the river. Persons exposing to sale unwholesome meat are to be fined from twenty-five to one hundred dollars.<sup>20</sup>

*Derbigny*—And in the same manner as in the case of flour, the price of butcher's meat is fixed from time to time by the City Council, and published in the newspaper, as also in bills stuck up in the market place.<sup>21</sup> No butcher or retailer of butcher's meat shall receive a price higher than that fixed by the tariff, even under pretense of a particular agreement with the buyer, and any seller offending this rule is subject to a fine of from ten to fifty dollars.<sup>22</sup>

*Moreau*—Anyone who forestalls or regrates, or causes to be forestalled or regrated any game, fish, poultry, eggs or provisions whatever, within the city or the liberties thereof, with the intent to sell again the same provisions, either in the streets or in the market, is subject for every such offence to a fine of from five to fifty dollars.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, concerning the public market, approved October 25, 1809, Art. 7.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, Art. 14.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, Art. 21.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, Art. 22.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, Art. 23.



*Livingston*—Due to the large quantity of tainted meat, it has been more recently provided that no meat vended in the market is to be deposited in the market-hall after dusk, under penalty of confiscation. Butchers bringing their meat into the market too long before it opened caused much of it to spoil.<sup>24</sup> Thus, should these provisions be adequately administered, much of the problem should be solved.

*Derbigny*—A most significant step is the requirement that flour be graded in the usual three classes, that is, superfine, fine, and middling. Similar noteworthy provisions were made regarding beef and pork which are also placed in three classes, namely, mess, prime and cargo.<sup>25</sup>

*Moreau*—I quite agree that the grading of flour, pork and beef is a definite step forward. However, the right of the City to regulate the price of butcher's meat is of great importance. This was a great necessity, as you may remember the prices were periodically beyond the reach of many.<sup>26</sup> The very same thing was done in the case of the bakers. Their compensation was first limited to three dollars and a half, then raised to five dollars on each and every barrel of flour baked in the city.<sup>27</sup>

*Livingston*—As an economic principle I would agree with Mr. Adam Smith in disliking such government interference in the free flow of trade. But as in the case of all general rules, particular circumstances may cause them to be inapplicable. As in this case, I should believe that the rule of supply and demand might be set aside by regulation for the betterment of our society, that is, as regards its effect upon prices.

*Moreau*—Quite true. I might mention, at this point, Mr. Derbigny, concerning your interest in the grading of produce, that much has been done in regard to tobacco.

*Derbigny*—I am quite familiar with this matter. It seems that three inspectors have been appointed by the Governor, and that all tobacco offered for sale must be inspected and approved by these gentlemen.<sup>28</sup>

*Moreau*—Further, it has been required that each hogshead or cask of tobacco shall be branded by the inspectors as "first

<sup>24</sup> Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved June 14, 1810.

<sup>25</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 1 Sess. (1804-05), Chapter XLV; *Louisiana Acts*, 4 Leg., 2 Sess. (1820), p. 102.

<sup>26</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 1 Leg., 2 Sess. (1807), Chapter V.

<sup>27</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 2 Leg., 1 Sess. (1814-15), p. 10.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 2 Leg., 2 Sess. (1815-16), p. 150.

quality" or "second quality", and any cask of tobacco which shall not be found worthy of being branded shall be rejected as unmerchandise.<sup>29</sup> However, the matter involves a little more than a simple inspection. The tobacco must be inspected carefully in three different places, and two inspectors must agree on its quality.<sup>30</sup> This lends greater protection, I believe, to the consumer than might otherwise be had. And if any acts of the inspector are in contravention to these provisions he is penalized fifty dollars, and three such offenses deprives him of his commission.<sup>31</sup>

*Father Laplace*—You lawyers and physicians have great reason to concern yourselves regarding the health of your people and their welfare. But as for me, I believe their welfare may ultimately be better served by limiting the great gambling that curses this city.

*Livingston*—Quite true, Father. But I do believe that both our State and our City have treated the matter to the best of their ability and as well as circumstances have allowed. As you may know, in 1811 gambling was absolutely forbidden in Louisiana under penalty of fine and imprisonment.<sup>32</sup> But, whereas, it was found impossible to prevent gambling, and to guard against the inconveniences and dangers resulting therefrom for the public tranquility, it was thought that by placing such houses under the immediate police of the Mayor, and submitting the same to such regulations as the City Council may from time to time think proper to make to put a stop to such dangers and abuses, that the houses in New Orleans and its suburbs should be exempted from the act of 1811.<sup>33</sup>

*Moreau*—Then, too, it has been demonstrated by experience that the laws enacted to establish gambling houses were insufficient and that the best means to resort to in such cases would be such, after the example of other governments equally wise and enlightened, as to turn to the advantage of the poor the evils that such houses cause to society at large.<sup>34</sup>

*Lambert*—And this was indeed effected, as the revenue thereof was placed at the disposal of the Charity Hospital.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 Leg., 2 Sess. (1818), p. 46.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 Leg., 1 Sess. (1819), p. 50.

<sup>32</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 3 Leg., 2 Sess. (1811), Chapter XVII.

<sup>33</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 1 Leg., 3 Sess. (1814), p. 104.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 2 Leg., 1 Sess. (1814-15), p. 22; Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved May 6, 1811.



*Moreau*—This was done by providing that these houses should be licensed and bonded to the extent of twelve hundred dollars.<sup>36</sup> Later, lotteries were permitted to operate under a fifty-thousand-dollar-tax.<sup>37</sup>

*Livingston*—But then these measures of licensing the gaming houses and placing them under the inspection of the Mayor and subject to the regulation of the City Council did not repress the evil. But, on the contrary, encouraged this most alarming vice under the sanction of law. Therefore, in 1821, all acts approving of gambling were repealed.<sup>38</sup>

*Lambert*—But even so, the object contemplated by this act preventing gambling was not attained, and the only effects in favor of good morals were nugatory. And as the Charity Hospital had been deprived of the greater part of its revenue which was necessary for its existence, the act preventing gambling was repealed. And so, now we have only six licensed gambling houses in New Orleans and its suburbs, which are each taxed five thousand dollars annually. To prevent, as much as possible, citizens from being tempted into gambling, it has been provided that no gambling should be done within the general public view.<sup>39</sup> Thus you see, Father, the problem has not been an easy one. An adequate solution is yet to be found.

*Father Laplace*—I should perhaps capitulate, gentlemen, for as a newcomer to the city, I knew not the history of your problem. However, from what I have seen of your town, much could be done to raise the moral standards of the people.

*Derbigny*—Much has been done in this respect.

*Laplace*—Such as?

*Derbigny*—The Council has taken great concern in regard to public entertainment. The manager or acting manager of every theater must on penalty of imprisonment, and of a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars, lay before the Mayor his prompt book, which the Mayor is to examine, and retrench from the same all dramatic pieces that, in his judgment, may tend to corrupt the morals or disturb the tranquility of the public.<sup>40</sup>

*Laplace*—Very good.

<sup>36</sup> Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved May 6, 1811.

<sup>37</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 5 Leg., 2 Sess. (1822), p. 82.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 5 Leg., 1 Sess. (1820-21), p. 56.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 6 Leg., 1 Sess. (1823), p. 78.

<sup>40</sup> Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved September 22, 1808.

*Derbigny*—And should any manager presume to announce any piece without the examination of the Mayor, or which he has forbidden, the Mayor may further cause the theater to be shut, and to oppose, by all means afforded him by the laws and ordinances of police, such performances.

*Laplace*—Without doubt, if such a law is conscientiously administered, the City will greatly profit.

*Derbigny*—However, the act was soon found to be wanting. Actors took the liberty to change the nature of their parts, by substituting for the expressions or phrases of the author of the play approved by the Mayor, phrases or expressions derogatory to good morals, or to the maintenance of the social order. So it was decreed that any actor who should offend in this manner would be immediately condemned by the Mayor or a Justice of the Peace to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars and not less than twenty-five dollars, or in default, to imprisonment.<sup>41</sup> If any manager is found to have consented that the part of one or more actors be disguised in the above manner, the Mayor is authorized to have the theater closed.<sup>42</sup> By such means the Council has attempted to exclude from the public view those things which tend to degrade their morals.

*Lambert*—Further, much has been done to lessen the trouble with and among the Indians and slaves. Tavern keepers have been prohibited from selling to the Indians or to slaves, without their master's consent, or to soldiers, without the permission of a commissioned officer, any intoxicating liquor, under a penalty of two hundred dollars.<sup>43</sup>

*Moreau*—In the past much trouble was caused by such sales.

*Livingston*—In the same manner, peddlers and hawkers may not sell or purchase of any slave any article whatsoever, without his master's consent, under a penalty of from ten to one hundred dollars.<sup>44</sup> Nor are they to sell or deliver to any slave any kind of arms or ammunition without his master's permission.<sup>45</sup>

*Laplace*—Without doubt these prohibitions were provided for the protection of the masters against their slaves.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, approved February 8, 1818, Art. 1.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, Art. 2.

<sup>43</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 1 Leg., 1 Sess. (1806), Chapter X; *Louisiana Acts*, 1 Leg., 2 Sess. (1812-13), p. 10.

<sup>44</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 2 Leg., 2 Sess. (1809), Chapter XV.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 Leg., 2 Sess. (1811), Chapter XIV.

*Moreau*—Quite true, and as you will no doubt soon discover, the great majority of the slaves are dishonest and can easily be led to rioting or the like. The possibility of insurrection should never be considered too lightly.

*Lambert*—The experience of St. Domingo should have taught all slaveholding people this lesson.

*Derbigny*—With the talk of so many restrictions, I believe we gentlemen might be giving Father Laplace a misconception of our City and State.

*Livingston*—We are really more free than we might sound. As a matter of fact much legislative assistance has been granted to help the development of the state. The legislature has in innumerable instances granted exclusive privileges for periods of years to individuals so as to induce private capital to invest in the building of bridges, the operation of ferries, the building of roads, and canals.<sup>46</sup> By such legislative assistance both the state and the contractors have benefited.

*Laplace*—But even so, there are some limits to these exclusive privileges?

*Moreau*—True, the privileges have been given only on condition of certain detailed provisions as to the rates to be charged. A familiar illustration to all present is the bridge at the entrance of Bayou Lafourche, which I might say is typical, and of which bridge I have, by chance, a rate schedule which reads as follows:

- For every loaded wagon with a full team, 50¢
- For every empty wagon with a team, 37½¢
- For every loaded cart and team, 37½¢
- For every empty cart and team, 25¢
- For every four-wheeled pleasure carriage with team, 75¢
- For every two-wheeled pleasure carriage with team, 50¢
- For every man and horse, 12½¢
- For every single horse, 6¼¢
- For every head of meat cattle, 3¢
- For every sheep, swine or goat, etc., 1¢
- For every foot passenger, 6¼¢

And the penalty for abusing the privileges or overcharging passengers or their produce is generally severe. In the instant

<sup>46</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 2 Leg., 2 Sess. (1815-16), p. 68; 3 Leg., 1 Sess. (1816-17), pp. 62, 112; 3 Leg., 2 Sess. (1818), pp. 28, 106; 4 Leg., 1 Sess. (1819), p. 118; 4 Leg., 2 Sess. (1820), pp. 40, 48, 100; 5 Leg., 1 Sess. (1820-21), pp. 16, 20, 24; 5 Leg., 2 Sess. (1822), p. 106.



case it is five hundred dollars.<sup>47</sup> It has been found necessary in the case of privileges *vested with a public interest* to carefully guard against abuse.

*Livingston*—Yet, there are certain cases where exclusive privileges have been granted without stringent requirements as to rates.

*Laplace*—Such as?

*Livingston*—I have in mind, as you other gentlemen may well remember, the grant extended to Benjamin H. Latrobe and his associates by the City of an exclusive privilege to supply water to the City of New Orleans and its suburbs, and to distribute it into the houses, lots or premises of those inhabitants of the City who may require it of them. It is interesting to note that no rates are set with which Latrobe and his associates need comply, but instead, it is provided that the purchaser of such service shall pay them in return such an annual rent as may be stipulated between the two parties.<sup>48</sup> This is indeed a case of a privilege without limitations, that is, as to rates.

*Moreau*—This may well be explained by the great expense involved in the construction of such a complex system. And further, being a new system, it would be impossible to determine a just rate. To attempt to do so would be to cause injury either to Latrobe or to the citizens.

*Livingston*—Quite true.

*Derbigny*—The legislature has also helped in other ways to promote commerce and trade in the State. I have in mind the establishment of uniform standard weights and measures.

*Moreau*—This was a very needed measure. As I understand the question, the City first acted in 1805 by establishing a gauger, measurer, weigher and inspector of weights and measures for the City. He was to have the proper standards made for all weights and measures in use in commerce.<sup>49</sup> However, the resolution did not state which measures were the proper measures. Thus, this first attempt was not completely satisfactory. But now, that is, since 1814, weights and measures throughout the State are of the same denomination used by the revenue officers of the United States in their offices, together with scales of said

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 Leg., 1 Sess. (1816-17), p. 112.

<sup>48</sup> Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved May 22, 1811.

<sup>49</sup> Resolution of the City Council of New Orleans, adopted August 14, 1805.

weights and a stamp or seal with the device which was chosen by Governor Claiborne. We further have a complete set of measures calculated for dry, liquid, and long measures of the same capacity and length as those used by the revenue officers.<sup>50</sup>

*Livingston*—And, of course, the use of any standard of measure, other than that approved by the inspector, is illegal.<sup>51</sup>

*Moreau*—However, I believe that the great improvement in trading conditions can only be appreciated by those who had to buy and sell under the old system. The new system, as the old, was enforced by an inspector, and each set of measures had to be annually approved and must bear his seal.<sup>52</sup>

*Laplace*—For a relatively old colony, it seems that such a uniform standard would have been provided for long ago.

*Derbigny*—Not so, for the new law seeks uniformity both internally and externally, that is, with the other States and the Federal Government. Then too, the colony having changed hands so frequently it was hard for any one system to become well established.

*Laplace*—Speaking of trade, with which you seem to be very familiar, Mr. Derbigny, how does the City control the port of New Orleans?

*Derbigny*—The government of the port is very efficient. At the head of the port is the Harbor Master who is appointed by the Governor, and who has full control in the management of the port. It is he who regulates and stations all ships and vessels in the stream of the river, within the limits of the City. It is his duty to remove from time to time such ships and vessels as are not employed in receiving and discharging their cargoes, and to make room for such others as require to be more immediately accommodated for the purpose of receiving and discharging theirs. He must determine how far, and in what instances, it is the duty of the master and others having charge of ships and vessels to accommodate each other in their respective situations. And if any master resist or oppose the Harbor Master in the execution of his duties, he does so under a penalty of fifty dollars.

He further has the general power of enforcing and superintending all the laws of the State and City, and for preventing and removing all nuisances on the City levee.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>50</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 2 Leg., 1 Sess. (1814-15), p. 24.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 1 Sess. (1804-05), Chapter XXIV.



*Laplace*—The Harbor Master has many duties.

*Derbigny*—Indeed, for in addition, he must see that all pilots of the port register their names and places of abode, respectively, and the name, size and dimensions of the pilot boats used by them. He has the right to order any branch pilot or deputy pilot whom he may find in the City to return to his station at the Balize. The pilot must obey under penalty of fifty dollars, or if the master or wardens deem it necessary, they may render him incapable of acting as a pilot.<sup>54</sup>

*Livingston*—Mr. Derbigny fails to mention that the Master at one time received from the commander or owner of every ship that entered the port to load, unload or make safe to the levee at the rate of three cents per ton, which was computed from the tonnage expressed in the registers of the ship.<sup>55</sup> But since 1816 the ships have been divided into classes according to their weight and charged a flat rate. Due to the prosperity of the port the rate was greatly increased.<sup>56</sup> This naturally does not extend to chalans, flats or keelboats in river trade.<sup>57</sup>

*Laplace*—But this Harbor Master does not work all by himself, does he?

*Derbigny*—Obviously not. The Harbor Master has three subordinate wardens, and two branch pilots who may appoint pilots under them. However, all must duly qualify by being a fit and proper person for the position.<sup>58</sup> You see, the port authority is really a little government in itself, as the Master and Wardens, with the consent of the Governor, may make such rules and regulations for the better government of the pilots as they deem proper, and from time to time revoke or amend them. Any three of the Master and Wardens may impose fines on pilots for the breach of these rules.<sup>59</sup>

*Laplace*—And what qualifications must the pilots possess?

*Derbigny*—Besides being fit and proper persons in the eyes of the Master and Wardens, every pilot must be the owner or part owner of a pilot boat of not less than twenty-two foot keel, and seven and one-half foot beam, and must row not less than twelve oars. These boats must be kept exclusively employed

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> Ordinance of the City Council of New Orleans, approved December 7, 1816.

<sup>57</sup> *Territory of Orleans Acts*, 1 Sess. (1804-05), Chapter XXIV.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*

as pilot boats. As compensation the pilots receive two dollars for every foot a ship shall draw, besides compensation when ships are in distress.

*Laplace*—From what you have so clearly told me I can well see that the port would be efficiently managed. And with efficient management I may well presume that the revenues derived therefrom are substantial, perhaps sufficient to reduce the burdens of taxation.

*Livingston*—Excepting recent years, the revenues have not been so substantial. For as you well know, the expenses of the war caused a great drain on the financial resources of the State, so that after the war extraordinary means had to be used for raising the revenue.

*Laplace*—Extraordinary means?

*Livingston*—Indeed, for an act was passed providing that every person residing or holding property in this State should annually pay to the State a tax of one dollar on each hundred of the gross amount of the income or revenue derived from his property, capital stock and industry.<sup>60</sup>

*Laplace*—This was indeed a very heavy tax.

*Livingston*—And also a very inclusive one, for the salaries and perquisites of all public officers in the service of the State and also persons employed by and receiving from any corporation a yearly salary were considered as taxable revenue, subjecting the individual enjoying the same to the payment of a tax of one percent.<sup>61</sup>

*Moreau*—Such a law seemed rather bad policy, for the tax was in fact reducing the wages of the State and City officers or employees and in so doing altering their contracts.

*Livingston*—However, the tax was not extended to cover rice and corn, and other produce that was raised by the proprietors for their own use, or the use of their families or slaves, and persons whose annual revenue or income did not exceed one hundred dollars were excepted from the tax.<sup>62</sup>

*Laplace*—Such a tax must have been very difficult to enforce, and easy to evade.

<sup>60</sup> *Louisiana Acts*, 2 Leg., 1 Sess. (1814-15), p. 94.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*

*Livingston*—Not so, for every year the appraisers in the several parishes, when they made their appraisements of property, were also to enquire into the income or revenue of every person residing in their respective parishes, and to this effect, they were to demand of every resident, and of the agent of every non-resident, a declaration of each of the articles composing their revenue in the parish. These declarations were to be inscribed in a column to be added to the assessment role.<sup>63</sup>

*Laplace*—But what if a person possessed estates in some other parish, and exercised his industry or derived a benefit on his capital stock in another parish?

*Livingston*—In such a case the declarations of the revenues and perquisites of such an individual were made by a declaration of his lands, establishments, houses or other property, before the appraisers of the parishes within which such estates lay, and the declaration of the profit derived from his industry or his capital stock, before the appraisers of the parish wherein he resided.

Any person making a false declaration with the intention to elude the payment of the tax was condemned to pay double the amount of the tax, and was declared incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under the authority of the State.<sup>64</sup> Thus, though it may have been tempting to evade the tax in certain cases, the penalty was great.

*Derbigny*—Quite true. And as I recall, it was provided that if any owner of property should refuse to pay the tax to be levied, in pretense of not having sold his crop, he was compelled to produce the crop, and the value was appraised by the owner and the collector jointly, according to the current price, so as to ascertain the amount of the tax on said crop, which tax was to be paid in the same manner as if the crop had been sold.<sup>65</sup> As the income was not actually produced until the crop was sold, this was a rather surprising provision.

*Livingston*—Thus the tax was as severe as the needs were great. But fortunately, as we know, the period following was very prosperous,<sup>66</sup> so that the combined resentment of the taxpayers and prosperous times brought about a quick repeal.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> John F. Condon, "Annals of Louisiana," in Francois Xavier Martin, *A History of Louisiana from the Earliest Period* (New Orleans, 1882), 413.



*Moreau*—The period following the war was a happy one for Louisiana. And as trade increased and the port grew larger, due to the great influx of people, more modern and humane methods had to be created to deal with the current misfortunes of commercial life. As we all can remember, it was not very long ago that one of us might have been thrown into prison for an unpaid debt, and, unless he had friends, forced to remain there an indefinite period, with no means of discharging his obligation. Needless to say, such a system was both unwise in its treatment of the debtor and in its means of securing the interest of the creditors.

*Derbigny*—Very true. There are many cases where great injustice was wrought.

*Moreau*—And so it was that in 1817 it was provided that every individual who had not yet been imprisoned for debt, but who was unable to meet his engagements, might avoid debts by surrendering all his estate to his creditors, provided the surrender was made bona fide, and without fraud, and agreeably to the formalities prescribed.<sup>67</sup>

*Laplace*—But how are the creditors protected from possible fraud?

*Moreau*—It is provided that the debtor shall present his petition to any judge of competent jurisdiction, within the place of his domicile or usual residence, stating briefly the unfortunate circumstances which oblige him to call his creditors, and conclude with a prayer to be allowed to make said call, at such time and place as the court may direct, in order that he may lay before his creditors a statement of his affairs, and surrender them his estate.

The debtor must annex to his petition, his schedule, that is to say, a summary statement of his affairs, and the losses he may have experienced, mentioning the names of his creditors, their places of residence, and the amount of their respective claims, and a statement of all his property, as well movable as immovable, and the insolvent rights and actions, together with a mention of the approximate value of the property by him assigned.<sup>68</sup>

*Laplace*—Such a man is free from prison, but also free to starve.

<sup>67</sup> Louisiana Acts, 3 Leg., 1 Sess. (1816-17), p. 126.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

*Derbigny*—Not quite, as he is not bound to include in his schedule the clothes and linen to his use, or that of his wife and family, the beds in which they sleep and their appurtenances, such as mattresses and the like, nor his arms and militia accoutrements, nor the instruments or tools indispensable for the exercise of the trade or profession which enables him to gain his livelihood.<sup>69</sup>

*Laplace*—That is good, as a just man will have occasion to regain his wealth and discharge his obligations. But continue.

*Derbigny*—Then you see, a provisional syndic is appointed to administer the debtor's property until the creditors are called, and that time a permanent syndic is appointed. It is he who manages the property and pays the creditors according to their rank.<sup>70</sup>

*Moreau*—Naturally, if the kindness of the State is met by fraud on the part of the debtor he is severely punished. He is deemed forever incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under the government of this State and is liable to be prosecuted and punished as a perjurer.<sup>71</sup>

*Laplace*—What acts on the part of the debtor are considered as fraudulent?

*Derbigny*—Any debtor who conceals his person or any of his property, with the intention to keep them from his creditors, as also those who are merchants or shopkeepers, who shall be convicted of having concealed their commercial books and papers with the same intention, and the same is true of any insolvent debtor who shall abscond or absent himself from his usual place of residence, without leaving to his creditors any account of his affairs, and without having previously surrendered to them his property, or who shall carry off with him any of his goods or effects or shall transfer the same to any other place, in order to deprive his creditors thereof.<sup>72</sup>

*Moreau*—Naturally, no person can enjoy the benefit of this proceeding unless he has resided in this State at least one year.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

*Derbigny*—This is only natural because were it not so the creditors' interest might be greatly impaired and placed at the peril of thieves.

*Livingston*—Quite true. However, besides aiding in the growth and development of commerce in this manner, the Legislature has, in recent years, acted to induce the invention of new devices. As a reward the inventor has an exclusive right to use, manufacture and sell his invention for a designated number of years.

*Moreau*—I heard the very same mentioned the other day. It seems that Richard Claiborne is the sole inventor of the hinge or duck-foot paddle, to the improvement of which he has devoted much time and labor. In recognition of his efforts the legislature has given him the exclusive privilege of navigating, working or propelling boats by or with the hinge or duck-foot for some fourteen years.<sup>74</sup>

*Lambert*—I fully approve of such rewards. The inducement to young inventors cannot be too great. The development of the State and advancements in the fields of science depend upon adequate compensation and recognition to those who labor where others have not dared to tread.

*Moreau*—There are also other examples.

*Derbigny*—Of course, I am quite familiar with these cases. I believe it was one Raoul that was granted a similar privilege on his discovery of an efficient means of destroying grass-nut.<sup>75</sup>

*Moreau*—Then there was J. Dujarreau who was given the exclusive right and privilege for fifteen years of constructing, using and vending cotton presses in this State, on the plans he had presented to the legislature. This grant was made, however, on the proviso that they were really his plans, and that the construction of the same was different from any now in use.<sup>76</sup>

*Livingston*—And more recently William Robertson was given the exclusive privilege of employing certain watercraft called smacks in bringing live fish into the market of New Orleans, on the condition that he could show that such crafts have not heretofore been employed but by himself in supplying said market, and on condition that Robertson never has less than sixty tons of these crafts employed in furnishing the market.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 Leg., 2 Sess. (1818), p. 198.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 114.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 Leg., 1 Sess. (1819), p. 60.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 Leg., 2 Sess. (1820), p. 90.



*Lambert*—Thus we may say that the State in granting rewards to inventors has always looked to the protection of the public.

*Moreau*—Quite true. In the same manner, perhaps, this new law will work for the betterment of the State, though at this moment I must admit that my doubts are great. I would say that the opinion of the townspeople should have been more carefully sought after and considered.

It had grown late in the town. Time dictated that I should continue on my way. And so I left this learned group. I was happy, for I had listened to a discussion that had interested me much. But I was still thoughtful, for my question had not been answered. The new ordinance had given the Council very broad powers, and I questioned whether these were not beyond the limits granted the Council by our City Charter. But even if the laws were valid, I questioned its necessity and its wisdom. However, my answer could, it seemed, come only with time—when time would surely speak again as to the wisdom of the laws of man.

## A COLLECTION OF LOUISIANA CONFEDERATE LETTERS

---

*Edited by* FRANK E. VANDIVER

---

### INTRODUCTION

It has been said that one of the greatest sources of material on the Southern Confederacy is the letter of the common soldier. In this collection, that common soldier extends to the reader a completely human picture of his various moods. He is burning with patriotic fervor; he is melancholy, homesick, and sometimes ill. But through all his troubles he shows a keen interest in his messmates and his surroundings. His patriotic ideas could well be limited by some of us today.

The collection of letters is in the possession of Mrs. Sallie Lee Boner of Austin, Texas, to whom the editor is indebted for permission to publish them. The correspondence is entirely that of Mrs. Boner's relatives. Henry C. Lee was her father; and E. Jefferson Lee, George M. Lee, and William C. Lee were her uncles. These four Lee brothers, as well as Starling C. Lee and Rufus L. Lee (mentioned in several of the letters), were sons of Eaton and Dorcas Stokes Lee of Union Parish, Louisiana, who were the parents of fourteen children. Jordan G. Taylor, Jr., to whom a majority of the letters were addressed, was a brother-in-law of the Lee brothers; and Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor, the recipient of many of the letters, was their sister and the wife of Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.

E. Jefferson Lee and Henry C. Lee served in the Confederate armies operating in the lower Mississippi Valley, while George M. Lee and William C. Lee were sent with the Louisiana forces to the Virginia theater of operations early in the war and apparently spent the entire period of their service in that eastern section of the Confederacy.

E. Jefferson Lee (or E. J. Lee, as listed in the records) enlisted in Company C, 17th Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, on September 29, 1861, at Camp Moore, Louisiana. He was apparently made a Second Sergeant at the time of his enlistment

or shortly thereafter; and on May 23, 1862, he was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant. He was continuously in the service from the date of his enlistment until he was captured and paroled at Vicksburg, Mississippi, on July 4, 1863, except for a furlough from December 29, 1861 to January 19, 1862, and a sick leave in July and August, 1863.<sup>1</sup> His only living descendant is Emmett J. Lee, editor and publisher of *The Gazette* of Farmerville, Louisiana, the official journal of Union Parish.

George M. Lee (or G. M. Lee, or George Lee, as listed in the records) enlisted in Company A, 6th Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, on June 4, 1861, at Camp Moore, Louisiana. He re-enlisted for the war on February 7, 1862, at Camp Carondelet, Virginia. The records list him as a corporal, but it is not stated whether he held this rank from his first enlistment or from the time of his re-enlistment. He died of pneumonia on February 19, 1862, at Camp Carondelet, Virginia.<sup>2</sup> He was never married and therefore left no descendants.

William C. Lee enlisted as a private in Company A, 6th Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, on July 26, 1861, at Union Mills, Virginia. He was detached as Sutler by Regimental Order No. 50, dated August 3, 1861. He re-enlisted at Camp Carondelet, Virginia, on February 7, 1862; but he was absent in the hospital from March to June, 1862, apparently. He was again in the hospital at Danville, Virginia, in September, 1862, where he apparently remained for many months thereafter. The records state that he was discharged from the service for disability on December 16, 1862, by the commander of the post at Danville, Virginia, though the notice of such discharge was not received until June, 1863.<sup>3</sup> He was never married and had no descendants.

Henry C. Lee enlisted as a private in Company H, 31st Louisiana Infantry, on May 14, 1862, at Monroe, Louisiana. On January 1, 1863, he was transferred to Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, by order of Major General M. L. Smith.<sup>4</sup> He was the father of Mrs. Sallie Lee Boner of Austin, Texas, who has possession of the collection of letters here published.

Jordan G. Taylor, Jr., to whom a majority of the letters were written, was a lawyer and a school teacher. He was ap-

<sup>1</sup> Andrew B. Booth (compiler), *Records of Louisiana Confederate Soldiers and Louisiana Confederate Commands* (3 vols., New Orleans, 1920), Vol. III, Book 1, p. 704.

<sup>2</sup> Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 704.

<sup>3</sup> Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 708.

<sup>4</sup> There appear to be two entries for this soldier, one as "H. C. Lee" and the other as "Henry C. Lee". The entry under the former name states that he was captured and paroled at Vicksburg, July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, pp. 704-705.



parently never in the Confederate military service. He should not be confused with two other Louisiana Confederate soldiers listed in the records as "J. G. Taylor", one of whom was a private in Company G, 26th Louisiana Infantry, and was discharged from the service on September 1, 1862, with no reason given in the records for his discharge. He enlisted in New Orleans, and was probably not related to the Taylors of Union Parish.<sup>5</sup> The other "J. G. Taylor" listed in the records was Captain of Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who enlisted at Camp Moore, Louisiana, on September 29, 1861. He was made prisoner at the surrender of Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. He was finally paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, on June 18, 1865, after the close of the war.<sup>6</sup> This Captain Jordan Gray Taylor was from Union Parish, Louisiana, and is said to have been a cousin of Jordan G. Taylor, Jr., to whom the letters were written. He was long a prominent citizen of his native parish, from which he was elected a member of the Louisiana Legislature in the post-bellum period. This Captain Gray Taylor had a sister, Mary Jane, who married John Martin Lee of Union Parish, Louisiana. John Martin Lee and Mary Jane Taylor Lee were the parents of Jordan Gray Lee, Sr., of Baton Rouge, who once served as Louisiana Commissioner of Agriculture and Immigration, and was later for many years Professor and Head of the Department of Forestry in the Louisiana State University. Jordan Gray Lee, Jr., a nephew of Jordan Gray Lee, Sr., is now Dean of the College of Agriculture in the Louisiana State University; and Jordan Gray Lee, III, son of the Dean, is now a member of the faculty of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College.<sup>7</sup>

In transcribing these letters, no changes in spelling have been made. In cases where a word is not clear, the probable correct word follows in brackets. Letters missing in various words have been inserted in brackets. No rearranging or other corrections have been attempted. The Editor of the *Quarterly* has taken the liberty of deciding between "commas" and "periods" when the distinction is not clear in the letters, and of inserting periods at the end of sentences, as an aid to the readers of the letters.

<sup>5</sup> Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 777.

<sup>6</sup> Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 777.

<sup>7</sup> Letter, Emmett J. Lee to Walter Prichard, dated Farmerville, Louisiana, July 6, 1943; Interview of Walter Prichard, Editor of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, with Jordan Gray Lee, Jr., Dean of the College of Agriculture, Louisiana State University, July 5, 1943; Biographical Sketch of Jordan Gray Lee, Sr., in Henry E. Chambers, *History of Louisiana* (3 vols., Chicago and New York, 1925), II, 83-84.

The editor of the letters has had the assistance of Miss Fannie Ratchford and Dr. D. M. McKeithan of the University of Texas. Dr. E. Merton Coulter, also of the University of Texas, made some helpful suggestions. The editor is indebted to Mrs. Charles W. Ramsdell for her kindness in discussing the various problems that presented themselves in preparing the letters for publication.

The Editor of the *Quarterly* has supplied most of the footnotes identifying individuals mentioned in the letters. He is indebted to Mr. Emmett J. Lee, editor and publisher of *The Gazette*, Farmerville, Louisiana, for genealogical data on the Lee and Taylor families.

#### TRANSCRIPTION OF THE LEE LETTERS

*George M. Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Lay Va. August 26th 1861

J.G. Taylor Farmerville La

Dear Jordan, I received Jeff's<sup>8</sup> letter this morning under date of Aug. 18th, which I was more than glad to receive. I write this in reply to Jeff's letter. I would write to him, but I suppose from what he wrote me, that he is in Camp Moore:<sup>9</sup> if he is let me know in your next letter. Wm<sup>10</sup> has returned from *Richmond* with his goods, and has very near sold out; he will go to their again in a few days to buy another stock.<sup>11</sup> This letter leaves us both in fine health. I am as fat as pork & crackers with a hard bed to sleep on can make any one. Were you to see my Ambrotype now you would hardly recognize it. My hair long & disheveled and my face is as brown as a gingercake.

I have no war news to write you. Every thing is quiet so far as I know. But should any thing turn up we are ready cut and dried for the fight. It is getting very cool up here. We want

<sup>8</sup> The name by which the family called E. Jefferson Lee, a brother of the writer.

<sup>9</sup> Camp Moore was named for Thomas Overton Moore, Governor of Louisiana, 1860-1864. It was located near the village of Tangipahoa, in the Parish of the same name, on the New Orleans, Jackson, and Great Northern Railroad (now the main line of the Illinois Central), about seventy miles north of New Orleans. It was one of the main induction centers for Louisiana troops.

<sup>10</sup> William C. Lee, a brother of the writer, was also serving in the Confederate army in Virginia. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 708.

<sup>11</sup> William C. Lee had been detached from his regiment on sutler detail, as per Regimental Order No. 50, dated August 3, 1861. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 708.

two blankets to sleep under. If there is any boys their who want to join our company, tell them to come on, we will take them in.

If I could get a furlough to go home & see all my relatives & sweetheart once more, I would then be willing to stay until our independence is acknowledged, or die with her noble sons in the struggle for liberty. I would like to write you a full history of the little incidents of Camp life had I the time & opportunity for I know you would be amused at them & no doubt say that they were tales of fiction. We have only received one months pay since we were mustered into the service, have received no clothing only what we have bought with our own money, but will receive a regimental uniform in a few days. Tell *Mother* I wish she would cook me a real good country dinner & send it to me by mail, a good peach cobbler for instance it would go down faster than rain. Jord, you cant imagine the inconveniences & vicissitudes that a soldier has to undergo but in a cause like this of ours we should sacrifice all the comforts & necessities of life, & offer our bodies a living sacrifice if necessary at the alter of our common Country. Jord, these are my sentiments & were at the time, that the boys were disbanded at Camp Moore. Some perhaps censured me for not going home with the other boys from Camp Moore, but to-day I am proud that I was one who in that trying day counted not the loss of the comforts & pleasures of this life but consulted & enlisted in the service of the glorious Southern Confederacy. Jord, our cause is a glorious & holy one and I for one am willing that my bones shall bleach the sarced [sacred] soil of Virginia in driving the envading host of tyrants from our soil. It is after tattoo & I must blow out my candle. Give my love to all the family & tell them though I be in a distant land the chords of kindred affection bind them near to me & I hope that the time will soon come when I shall be allowed to return to them all a free man, their to spend the remainder of my days among them enjoying the fruits of my present Vicissitudes. Tell *Sis*<sup>12</sup> to be certain & write & give me all the news she has. Some of you can write as often as once a week, without any inconvenience. Give my love to all enquiring friends & especially the girls.

Your Brother in Law

G.M. Lee

---

<sup>12</sup> He refers to his sister, Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor, wife of Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.



*George M. Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Beauregard near Fairfax C.H. Va. Oct 2d [1861]

Dr Jord

Your letter of the 21st of Sept came to hand three days ago, and I would of answered it immediately but I could not. The Morning I received it, we were in the act of leaving: our whole Brigade, on a reconnoitering expedition up the Potomac. We have been gone three days, during the time we made one or two feints to attack the enemy, and at one place we fired forty or fifty case shots at the enemy on the opposite side of the river, but he did not have the nerve to return the fire.

Our battery was placed on this side of the river on an eminence which over looked the Potomac, and in full view of the enemy's lines. During the firing from our battery, our Company was placed down on the bank of the river in two hundred yards of the enemy but we were not allowed to fire! unless the enemy attempted to cross the river. The balls from our battery made pretty music as they passed harmlessly over our heads, but no doubt spread terror in the ranks of the enemy. This occurrence was at the Great Fall's of the Potomac several miles above Washington.

We were gone three days, and I am worn out with the fatigues of the March.

There is some talk of a fight on this side of the Potomac soon. It is said that the enemy are advancing on us in large numbers. If they are we will have a fight ere this reaches you.

When you write again, give me Jeff's address, for I shall want to write to him.

The weather here is chilly. We have had two or three frosts.

*George Brantly*<sup>13</sup> of Marion died last night. He has been sick for a long time and suffered much: I fear for want of proper attention. Our boys have gone to bury him.

My own health and that of the other boys is tolerable good.

Those promised clothing would be highly exceptable to us.

I would write to *Mother* but this will answer for you all, and my chances for writing is very bad.

<sup>13</sup> George W. Brantley, a private in Company A, 6th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore, Louisiana, on June 4, 1861, and died in the Regimental Hospital, near Centerville, Virginia, on October 1, 1861. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 93.

The boys here of your acquaintance here all send you and the family their best respects.

Give my love to *Sis Mother* the boys,<sup>14</sup> and receive the same for your self. Tell Redic & Cloe<sup>15</sup> Howdie for me.

Excuse this short & uninteresting letter for I am really too much fatigued to write.

Hoping to hear from you soon: I will close by subscribing myself

Your friend

G.M. Lee

*William C. Lee to E. Jefferson Lee*

Manassas Junction Va Oct 10th 1861

Dear Bro Jeff:

This letter leaves me and George<sup>16</sup> in good health, and hope you are enjoying the same.

We have had no fight as yet on the Potomac, though one is expected every day. You get the papers, and know as much as we do. I am now seperated from the Regt on detached service.<sup>17</sup> Our Regt is on the advanced front of the army—and I am at Manassas, in Charge of the Baggage of the Regiment. I am now Eightteen miles from the Regt. I hear from them every day.

I regretted verry much to have to come back to Manassas, but it was the Order of the Col of our Brigade.

The most of our Boys are in good health, and are anxious for a fight. I hope you will keep the Yankees off the . . . [illegible].

Your Bro

W. C Lee

*George M. Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor*

Camp Florida Near Centerville Va. Dec 16'/61

Dear Sister:

Several days have elapsed since I wrote to any of you: and again I feel it my duty to write to you: although I have not received a letter from any of you since I last wrote. It is only

<sup>14</sup> He probably refers to his younger brothers still at home.

<sup>15</sup> Redic and Cloe, mentioned also in another of the letters, were probably the children of the Taylors.

<sup>16</sup> George M. Lee, a brother of the writer, was a member of the same Confederate regiment.

<sup>17</sup> See footnote 11, above.

an impulse or a sense of duty, that causes me to write. For news I have none, and no talent or skill as a writer to display. We are still in fine health. My own health was never better than at present, but our spirits are drooping and languid, at the idea of passing off of 4 long winter months in camps, with nothing to do nothing to love and not much to hope for. We will go into winter quarters soon, and I don't [know] what I shall do to pass off [f] the dull monotonous hours. If I had only some books to read,<sup>18</sup> how pleasantly could I pass off the time. And how much happier would I be if I could join the family circle around the hearth stone. Oh: will that day ever come, when the desvating [devastating] tide of war shall be rolled back, and peace be proclaimed throughout the land. What a shout of praise would be raised to *God*, and what a meeting of friends and relatives would take place! But I fear the Sunlight of peace prosperity and happiness has forever departed from our bright plaines and suny climes, and the horrors of war have swept from its plaines the bright features that joy use to ware. Yet though the present aspect of our political horizon be dark and dreary: "Yet hope shall brighten days to come and memory gild the past." The life of a soldier is hard, but the usages and blessings of liberty are sweet, and thus we are fighting for and in defense of all that life holds dear, and all that is worth living for. And hard is our lot, yet we bear it without a murmur. I have only four months and twenty days to serve, and should my life be spared I expect to see you all at the close of my term of service,<sup>19</sup> but only for a short time if the war continues for I expect to be a soldier as long as the war lasts.

I know thier are many young men in Union yet, who could well leave home in defense of thier country. But poor fellows I know thier hearts fails them at the idea of Volenteering. And to such I will say, our country is in danger, and sooner or later they will have to take up arms, either willingly or be forced.

Christmas is drawing near, and I want you to have a big egg nog and drink some for me, and if any of the girls should ketch your Christmas gift, you may give me away.

I do not think their will be any fight here this winter. The weather is getting too very cold for active operations.

<sup>18</sup> The better literary style of George M. Lee indicates that he was more interested in books than were his brothers that were in the Confederate military service.

<sup>19</sup> He did not live to complete his first term of enlistment, for he died of pneumonia on February 19, 1862, at Camp Carondelet, Virginia. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 704.



I received a letter from Starling<sup>20</sup> yesterday. I have not heard from Jeff in two months. Where is he and what is he doing? Tell Rufus<sup>21</sup> & Henry<sup>22</sup> to write to me. They have never written me a line. Remember me in a special manner to mother, Billy and Sudy Dean.<sup>23</sup>

Give my love to all the family and enquiring friends and receive a good portion for yourself.

Your Brother

G.M. Lee

Tell Redic and Cloe howdie for me.

*George M. Lee and Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor*

Camp Corondelett Va Dec 31st/ 61

Dear Sister:

Your kind letter of the 19th Inst. is at hand which afforded me much pleasure to pursue, and I am now seated for the purpos of replying but I fear that I shall not be able to interest you, for I am in one of my Melancholly Moods and consequently in a bad humor for writing.

I am generally very lively and very enthuseastic in our cause, but their are moments, when my mind wanders away from Virginia the "Mother of heroes and Statesmen" and the field of conflict between the two armies where some of the bloodiest battles on record have been fought, and where I have witnessed scenes that would strike your hearts with terror: from all the things my mind departs and roves over the pine caped hills of our own Louisiana, where I have spent the happiest days of my life, mingling in the society of those who are dear by nature, and those with whom I love from friendly associations. And Oh! may the time soon come, when the desolating of war will be rolled back, and peace be proclaimed and prosperity and happiness again smile on our sunny plains, and those who are now separated return to the bosom of their friends and home. "Though fate do her worst their are moments of joy, bright dreams of the past

<sup>20</sup> Starling C. Lee was a brother of the writer of the letter.

<sup>21</sup> Rufus L. Lee (listed in the records as R. L. Lee) was a brother of the writer of the letter. He enlisted as a private in Company A, 6th Louisiana Infantry, on April 2, 1862, in Union Parish, Louisiana, and died at Gordonsville, Virginia, on May 18, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 707.

<sup>22</sup> Henry C. Lee was another brother of the writer. For his Confederate service record, see "Intoduction", above.

<sup>23</sup> Billy and Sudy Dean were probably younger members of the large Lee family. It is impossible now to state their relationship to the writer of the letter.

which she cannot destroy! which come in the nighttime of sorrow and care and bring back the features that joy use to wear."

When our sky is unclouded the prospect before us is bright. When prosperity peace and happiness smile upon us, tis easy to banish in the giddy rounds of pleasure the stings of remorse the reproaches of a guilty conscience, but when our sky is overshadowed by the dark clouds of disappointment, when we grow weary of life's toils and fears, how sweet to think that we have a home in heaven, and a friend upon whom we can rely.

Our winter quarters are nearly completed, so that we can live comfortable the remainder of the winter. Uncle Cleaton<sup>24</sup> can tell you how we live and how cold the weather is up here. Your ambrotype I much appreciate. That and a lock hair are the only mementoes that I have. And I fear that the one who presented me with the lock of hair proved truant. It is none other than 13, 10, 11. I have not heard from her lately. The last letter I received from her trumped all my fond anticipations. I would write you the particulars, but some one else would be certain to see them. Sis you know that I am too old to be flattered by your praising my letters, for surely I am but an ordinary writer.

My health and Wm is, very good. Remember me in love to mother and tell her to be of good cheer for I will be at home after a few more months, provided I live. Give my love to all the family, also to the girls. And believe me ever

Your affectionate Brother

George

*George M. Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor*

Camp Corondolett Va. Jan. 16th 1861 [1862]

Dear Sister:

While thousands of weary soldiers are lying at no great distance from me insensible to all the toils and cares of this life, wrapt in the arms of sweet though hurried repose, and the bright stars are twinkling: busily traversing their diurnal orb which was given them by the hand that created them, and the broad faced Moon is shedding its pale rays of mellow light, but

<sup>24</sup> The identity of "Uncle Cleaton" is unknown at present.

ads splendour to the beauties of the plaines and mountains of Va. which are now decked with snow. All my messmates have retired and I am left alone, to reply to your kind letter of the 5th Inst which has just been received.

These are my moments of reflection and retrospection. Oh! what precious moments for soliloquising: Sweet Memories of absent friends bye gone scenes and happier days, fill the heart with pleasing though solemn reflections.

Their is no excitement here now, everything is dull, and the hours drag heavily away. Yet under all the adverse circumstances with which we are surrounded, the spirit and ardour of our troops is unabated. If we believe the Yankee organs we will have hot work before the 1st of March. The grand forward movement is to be made, from Columbus Ky to Norfolk Va is to be attacked by land and from Norfolk to New Orleans by water.<sup>25</sup> If that be true the big battle is to be fought that will certainly be at Manassas or Columbus. Our regt is in the reserve division of the army, and if we have a fight here the reserve division will either win or loose all the laurels of the day, for we will not be called into action unless it is to decide the fortunes of the day or pursue the enemy if routed.

We get a plenty to eat (Meat and bread) but we are tierd of it. We want some refreshments but am sorry to say that we get nothing of the kind but fresh oysters which we get from Richmond daily, and for the want of something better I have learned to relish them. I like them stewed fried or raw out of the shell. I am sorry to hear of Bros Jeff & Starling's indispositions, but I hope ere this they are restored to their wanted health.

I thought the girls had agreed not to marry until the volunteers returned, but it appears that they have broken or forgotten their pledge, but I wish peace prosperity and happiness to attend all those who may marry in our absence.

Give my respects to Miss Mollie E.<sup>26</sup> and tell her that I have not forgotten the scenes of former days. You indefinitely stated that you had given me away, but did not state to whom. My health is a little impaired from exposure while on outpost duty,

<sup>25</sup> He refers to the plan of attack, both by land and by sea, which the Federal authorities were about to launch against the Confederacy in the early spring of 1862.

<sup>26</sup> The identity of "Miss Mollie E." is unknown at present. She appears to have been a particular friend of the writer.



but I am now nearly well. Wm and the other boys of your acquaintance are in fine health.

Remember me in love to mother and the family, and tell Jord to write.

Tis late and I will close. Write soon and believe me

Your affectionate brother

George

"The lip may bequile with a dimple or smile but the test of affection, is a tear." G.

*George M. Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Winter Quarters Camp Corondelett Va Feby 3d 1861 [1862]

Mr. J. G. Taylor:

Dear Sir, Tis with pleasing reluctance that I take my pen in hand to drop you a few lines, for I have nothing to write, but the tale so often written to you and others, and you are certainly tierd of paying postage on letters of so little importance. But our term of service will expire in a few months, and I will not trespass on your liberality, but a few more times, before coming home, and was it not for informing the family of our whereabouts and health I would never write you again, for exclusive of that, I have nothing to write.

The "Yankee" papers are still boasting, that *McLelland*<sup>27</sup> will soon clean out the "rebels" at Manassas, but at present it is utterly impossible for an army to move, and when spring opens and the roads become firm, *McLellan* may advance on us, but when he comes, we will teach him to rue the day that, he assumed command of the "Federal army." For Centerville with its natural and artificial advantages, is next to impregnable. I think that no fears should be entertained for the safety of this place, but I fear the enemy will make some inroads on our seaboard, and at Bowling Green and Columbus Ky. We believe our forces thier are adequate to the emergency.<sup>28</sup>

The weather is very cold. Snow has fallen to day 6 inches in depth, and is still snowing to night. We have had a big spree

<sup>27</sup> He refers to Major General George B. McClellan, who had been placed in charge of the Federal forces operating in Virginia. The young Confederate soldier makes two "stabs" at spelling the name of the new Federal commander, but in neither does he spell it correctly.

<sup>28</sup> This letter was written shortly before the Federal advance in the West, which resulted in the capture of Forts Henry and Donelson and prepared the way for the great battle of Shiloh, early in April, 1862.

to-day throwing Snow balls, and I feel none the better for it to night.<sup>29</sup> I received Sallies'<sup>30</sup> letter of the 20th ult yesterday, and I intend this as a reply to her letter. Tell Sis it is too tedious and unnecessary for me to answer her interrogatories, and she must wait until I come home. I shall, if I live be at home between the 1st and 10th of June, but if the war continues I shall not stay thier but a short time, unless Rufus and Henry wants to volenteer. If they do then I shall stay at home and let them go.

Robt Lasseter<sup>31</sup> left here a few days since for home. I sent Mother a pipe by him, one of my own make. It is made of wood called "Iva" which grows spontaneously on *Bull Run*.

Frank Lowe<sup>32</sup> left here two days ago en route home. He will go to Union before returning, so you can send me news by him on his returning. *John Archer*<sup>33</sup> is here. He is a little sick and will not leave until Henry Archer<sup>34</sup> gets his discharge.

The boys are all in good health except James Gilbert.<sup>35</sup> He is a little indisposed from cold.

Time rolls off very slowly. The time we have to stay here, seems almost an age.

I have written all that I know, and must close.

Give my love to Mother and the family, and my regard to all our friends.

Your Brother in Law

G. M. Lee<sup>36</sup>

<sup>29</sup> Such unaccustomed exposure may have been the cause of the writer's death, which occurred from pneumonia, on February 19, 1862.

<sup>30</sup> Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor, sister of the writer and wife of the recipient of the letter.

<sup>31</sup> This is probably the man carried on the records as W. R. Lassiter, who was a private in Company A, 6th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Resaca, Georgia, on October 17, 1861. His service record is very scanty. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 667.

<sup>32</sup> A careful search of Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, reveals no man by this name in the service, although the letter seems to imply that he was in the same service with the writer, was going back to Louisiana on a furlough, and was expected to return to his command.

<sup>33</sup> No man by this name is listed in Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*. He may have been the father, brother, or a relative of the Henry Archer mentioned in the next sentence, who was there trying to secure Henry's release from the service.

<sup>34</sup> Henry Archer was a private in Company A, 6th Louisiana Infantry, who had enlisted at Camp Moore, Louisiana, on June 4, 1861. He is listed in the records as absent in the Louisiana Hospital at Richmond, Virginia, in September and October, 1861; and he died of chronic rheumatism at Camp Carondelet, Virginia, on February 1, 1862, which was two days before this letter was written. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 72.

<sup>35</sup> It is impossible to identify this man precisely from the entries in the records, as there were two men in the same company with George M. Lee, who might have answered to the name of James Gilbert. One, listed in the records as J. R. Gilbert, enlisted as a private in Company A, 6th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore, Louisiana, on June 4, 1861, was wounded in the battle of Sharpsburg or Antietam in September, 1862, and died in the hospital at Richmond, Virginia, on February 4, 1863. The other, listed in the records as T. J. Gilbert, enlisted in the same company at Camp Moore on May 28, 1861, and was sick in various hospitals in Virginia almost continuously from October 3, 1862, to February, 1864. He was among the prisoners of war paroled at Appomattox Court House, Virginia, on April 10, 1865. The records state specifically that this last named individual was a resident of Union Parish, Louisiana, that he was 80 years of age at the time of enlistment, that he was dark in complexion, had hazel eyes, and was six feet three inches tall. He was promoted to sergeant, date not stated. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, pp. 18-19.

<sup>36</sup> This was probably the writer's last letter home, as he died of pneumonia on February 19, 1862, a little over two weeks after this letter was written.

E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.

Camp Moore La Sept 14th 1861

J. G. Taylor:

Dear Brother I embrace the present opportunity of writing you a short letter this morning which leaves me in tolerable good health, but some of the boys are sick of which I will give you thier names, Old Bill Taylor,<sup>37</sup> Jim Hill,<sup>38</sup> W. A. Kirkpatrick,<sup>39</sup> S. J. Beaird.<sup>40</sup> The two last are going home. Jord we had a pleasant trip a coming down here. We arrived here on Thursday morning a[t] 5 o'clock. Jord our fair has been rough since we have been here, on account of not having no camp Eq[u]ipage. Our captain went on to the City<sup>41</sup> to get our camp eq[u]ipage and has not yet Returned, but is hourly expected. I hope we will fair better when he Returns. Jord there's about Two Thousand men here. Camp Moore is healthy at this time. I hear there's a few casses of mumps in some of the camps. Jord we was mustered into service yesterday for Twelve months. The thirteenth Regt is completed and will leave tomorrow for Richmond. We are in the fourteenth Regt. It is thought that we will never leave the state. I wrote to Starling as soon as I got here. I saw Mrs. Harvy<sup>42</sup> at Vicksburg and had a chat with her. I come in with our friend Martin Q Cambell<sup>43</sup> here yesterday. He is in

<sup>37</sup> It is difficult to identify this "Old Bill Taylor" from the records. There were four "Taylors" in the writer's company who might have answered to this name. There was an Elias W. Taylor from Union Parish, Louisiana, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who was among the prisoners of war paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, on June 9, 1865. S. W. Taylor, Second Lieutenant, Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and resigned from the service on February 1, 1863. W. D. Taylor, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, was absent on account of illness in December, 1861, and was discharged from the service on April 14, 1862. William M. Taylor from Union Parish, Louisiana, also a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, was among the prisoners of war paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, on June 9, 1865. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, pp. 775, 783, 784, 785.

<sup>38</sup> Probably William J. Hill, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, re-enlisted on May 23, 1862, at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, at which date he was promoted to Fourth Corporal; was reduced to the ranks on January 25, 1863; and was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 310.

<sup>39</sup> Enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, apparently as First Sergeant of Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, and was promoted to First Lieutenant of same company on May 23, 1862. He was absent on sick leave in latter part of 1862 and early months of 1863, part of the time in "City Hospital" (perhaps at Vicksburg), and was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 578.

<sup>40</sup> S. J. Beard (listed also in the records as S. G. Beard) enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore, on September 29, 1861, and was discharged from the service on December 19, 1862, "being over 40 years of age." Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 148.

<sup>41</sup> The term used by the rural folks in referring to New Orleans.

<sup>42</sup> Probably an intimate friend of the Lee family.

<sup>43</sup> Listed in the records as M. Q. Campbell, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, on May 23, 1862. The last entry in the records lists him as present in October, 1862, "Over 35 years of age," but does not state that he was released from the service on this account. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 236.



the Moorhouse company.<sup>44</sup> Jord my leaf is full and I must close. Write to me often for you have a good chance to write. Tell the boys that belongs to our company to come on. Give my Respects to my connection and friends. Direct your letters to Tangapahoe.<sup>45</sup> Good bye

E. J. Lee

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Moore Sept 24th 1861

J. G. Taylor:

Dear Brother your letter of the 21 is Just at hand and is hapily Received. I began to think that the folks in old Union had forgotten me. This makes eight letters that I have written back to old Union since I arrived here, and your letter is all the answer that I have Received. I dont know what's the matter with Starling. I have written him two letters and have Rec no answer. My health is very good at this time though I have been a little sick since I came here. I had a light attack of the flux last week. The health is tolerable good here at this time. With the exception of Diarrheer [diarrhea], the boys in our company is all up at this time. There's about 4000 men here.

News come here last night for no more men to leave. Also a report that an attack is expected on N. O. The thirteenth Regt has not yet left here, and I dont reckon they will leave at all. We are Drilling every Day, and is progressing finely. I am just getting over my home sick, and am well satisfied now, and will Remain so if I can keep well. Jord write to me who the candidats are for the state Legislature, and how politics are getting along in old Union. I must close my short letter, for I have to cook dinner. I wish I had some peas.

Your Brother

E. J. Lee

P. S. Direct your letters to Tangipahoe Care of Capt. Taylor<sup>46</sup> of the Phoenix Rifles.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Reference appears to be to the "Morehouse Southrons", from Morehouse Parish, which was Company H, 17th Louisiana Infantry. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 13.

<sup>45</sup> The village of Tangipahoe, in the parish of the same name, was the post office nearest to Camp Moore, Louisiana.

<sup>46</sup> J. G. Taylor (the Jordan Gray Taylor mentioned in "Introduction" to these letters) was Captain of Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, in which the writer was enlisted; but the records do not identify this company as the "Phoenix Rifles." Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 777.

<sup>47</sup> The Phoenix Rifles are identified in the records as Company D, 17th Louisiana Infantry. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 14.

E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.

Camp Moore 7 O'Clock at night Oct 13th 1861

J. G. Taylor:

Dr Brother I take the pleasure of writing you a few lines which leaves me enjoying fine health. Your letter through Sil Joiner<sup>48</sup> came safely to hand, and was happily Rec. Jord our boys are all taking the Measles. James Beaird,<sup>49</sup> John Boatright,<sup>50</sup> J. W. Cross,<sup>51</sup> Charly Rabun,<sup>52</sup> Joe Clayton,<sup>53</sup> Sam Love,<sup>54</sup> are all down with them. John Poston<sup>55</sup> and John Pickett<sup>56</sup> have had them but are well. There is a soldier buried here every day. They all die of Measles. Camp Moore is plum healthy with that exception. Jord we Rec the news of the glorious victory won by our little fleet at the mouth of the Mississippi River.<sup>57</sup> Camp

<sup>48</sup> S. L. Joiner, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and was captured and paroled at Vicksburg, on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 463.

<sup>49</sup> James Beard, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and died at Corinth, Mississippi, March 29, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 147.

<sup>50</sup> Probably J. N. Boatwright (also listed in the records as J. M. Boatwright and J. N. Boatright), who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and was transferred to the 31st Louisiana Regiment by order of General Smith on November 18, 1862. He was captured at Vicksburg, July 4, 1863, and paroled on June 12, 1865. He is listed as a resident of Union Parish. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 18.

<sup>51</sup> J. W. Cross, a corporal in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861. The records do not give the date of his death. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 489.

<sup>52</sup> Listed in the records as C. P. Raburn, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and was discharged from the service on December 22, 1862, "being under 18 years of age." Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 231.

<sup>53</sup> Listed in the records as J. C. Clayton, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861; was sick in the General Hospital in March and April, 1862; re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862; and was killed in battle near Vicksburg on December 27, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 353.

<sup>54</sup> Listed in the records as S. R. Love of Union Parish, Louisiana, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861; was promoted to First Corporal some time between that date and May 23, 1862, when he re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, and was promoted to Fourth Sergeant. He was captured at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863, and was paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, on June 15, 1865. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 800.

<sup>55</sup> Listed in the records as J. W. Poston, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, September 30, 1861, at Camp Moore; re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, and was captured at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 179.

<sup>56</sup> Listed in the records as J. F. Pickett, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862. He was present on the rolls of this company until December, 1862, when the entry for "J. F. Pickett" ends. However, a "John F. Pickett" (which seems to be the same name) is listed in the records as having enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and was transferred from the 17th Louisiana Regiment to Company H, 31st Louisiana Infantry, on January 1, 1863, where he served as a private until captured at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. He was forwarded to the Gratiot Street Military Prison in St. Louis, Missouri, July 26, 1863, and was transferred to Camp Morton on August 7, 1863, where he enlisted in the 71st Indiana Volunteers (U. S. Service) within the same month. A careful examination of the records leaves little or no doubt that the entries for "J. F. Pickett" and "John F. Pickett" refer to the services of one and the same soldier. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 140.

<sup>57</sup> He refers to the ram "Manassas" which was built by private subscription at New Orleans, and drove the Federal fleet out of the Mississippi River on October 12, 1861. This vessel was under command of Commodore Hollins, and it was later purchased by the Confederate States Government. J. Thomas Scharf, *History of the Confederate States Navy from its Organization to the Surrender of Its Last Vessel* (Albany, N. Y., 1894), 264.

Moore is in a flow of excitement. There is two Regts here at this time, and was both drawn out in colums this evening and the news of the victory was read to us by Col Preston Pond,<sup>58</sup> after which three cheers was call for from the Soldiers at Camp Moore, and cheers it was. I never heard the like in all my life. I wish that you could have heard it. It was hurra for Jeff Davis and the mud Turtle.<sup>59</sup> We are all Ready for the Yankees to attack N. O. If we are call for we can go there in four hours. Our Regimental officers have been to the city. They say that 20,000 Southern men can whip the whole north. They say that we have the city so well fortified that the Yankees can never take it. There is 200 cannons placed around the city. I need not give you the Result of the victory at the mouth of the Mississippi for you have it in the papers before this time. Another Regt has left here since I wrote you. They went to N. O. Jord the number of Our Regt is changed. We are the 17th Regt. Our company is the center company in the Regt, and will carry the flag. Jord you spoke as if you had some notion of volunteering. I advise you to stay at home. You could not stand the fairs and hardships of a Soldier. Tell Rufe and Henry to stay at home until I come back, but dont discourage those young men in old Union in any way, for some of them has no sand in thier craws no how. This is not to go any further, but Jord I do honestly beli[e]ve that there are individuals in Union Parish that would see the South Subjugated before they would lend an arm to defend. I would not take one years wages for what I already have learned about Military affairs. My leaf is full. Write to me often.

E. J. Lee

*E. Jefferson Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor*

Camp Moore La Oct 20th 1861 Tangipahoe Pa[rish]

Sallie your letter of the 17th Inst is just at hand and is happily Received. I have been looking for a letter from home for several days. I have not *Rec* a letter from home in ten days untill yesterday I Rec one from John Odom.<sup>60</sup> I am in as good health as I ever was. I am twelve lbs hevier than I was when I left home, and still fatening every day, but I am sorry to say

<sup>58</sup> Preston Pond, Jr., was elected Colonel of the 16th Louisiana Infantry on September 26, 1861, and his command entered the Confederate service on the 29th of the same month. He resigned from the service on May 2, 1862, and was succeeded by Daniel Gober. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 189.

<sup>59</sup> "Mud turtle" was apparently a nickname for the ram "Manassas", mentioned in footnote 57, above.

<sup>60</sup> Apparently an intimate friend of the writer. The Odom family are still prominent in Louisiana.



that our company is not enjoying good health. The Measles is raging here Rapidly. We have about twelve cases in our company, but they are all able to be up if the weather was not so bad. It has rained here two days in succession. Here is a list of the sick, *Viz* James Beaird,<sup>61</sup> Joe Clayton,<sup>62</sup> Charly Rabun,<sup>63</sup> John Boatright,<sup>64</sup> Sam Love,<sup>65</sup> Nic Thornton,<sup>66</sup> Wm Pearce,<sup>67</sup> Eli Tubb,<sup>68</sup> Wm Futch,<sup>69</sup> Ben McCullar,<sup>70</sup> Joe McDonald,<sup>71</sup> Ben Day,<sup>72</sup> Jno Picket,<sup>73</sup> John Poston,<sup>74</sup> C. H. Collom,<sup>75</sup> J. H. Chun,<sup>76</sup> A. B. Speir.<sup>77</sup> The above names have got the Measles. Some of

<sup>61</sup> See footnote 49, above.

<sup>62</sup> See footnote 53, above.

<sup>63</sup> See footnote 52, above.

<sup>64</sup> See footnote 50, above.

<sup>65</sup> See footnote 54, above.

<sup>66</sup> Listed in the records as N. W. Thornton, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862. He was promoted to the rank of Fourth Corporal on January 25, 1863, and was captured by the Federals at Port Gibson, Mississippi, May 2, 1863. He was received at the Alton, Illinois, Military Prison on May 18, 1863, where he was paroled until exchanged at City Point, Virginia, on June 18, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, pp. 828-829.

<sup>67</sup> There were two privates in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, either of whom may be the individual referred to here: W. N. Pierce and W. W. Pierce. However, it appears rather evident from their records that the two entries in the records refer to one and the same soldier. Both enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and both were captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Only "W. N." is listed as having re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862; but this is the date on which all members of that company either re-enlisted or were released from service. The fact that both are listed as still in the service when Vicksburg was captured is further evidence that "W. N." and "W. W." Pierce were one and the same individual. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 144.

<sup>68</sup> Eli Tubb, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and died on November 4, 1861. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 876.

<sup>69</sup> Listed in the records as W. W. Futch, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and died on April 8, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 947.

<sup>70</sup> Probably Benjamin McCulloch, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and was marked "present" on all rolls to December, 1861, when entries for him cease in the records. However, the records list a "Benjamin McCullar" who enlisted as a private in Company E, 19th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore, on December 11, 1861, was promoted to First Corporal on November 4, 1864, and was among the prisoners of war paroled at Meridian, Mississippi, May 10, 1865; and also a "Benj. McCuller", who is listed in the records as First Corporal of Company A, Pelican Louisiana Infantry, and was among prisoners of war paroled at same place and on same date as the preceding entry. Both the last two entries are specifically stated in the records as residents of Union Parish, Louisiana. A careful scrutiny of the records leaves little doubt that all three of the above entries refer to one and the same soldier. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, pp. 1163-1164.

<sup>71</sup> Joseph McDonald, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and died on April 28, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 1176.

<sup>72</sup> Benjamin Day, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, and was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 565.

<sup>73</sup> See footnote 56, above.

<sup>74</sup> See footnote 55, above.

<sup>75</sup> C. H. Collom (also listed in the records as C. H. Collum and C. Colum) enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and died at Camp Chalmette, Louisiana, on November 4 or 5, 1861. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 394.

<sup>76</sup> J. H. Chun (also listed in the records as C. H. Chum) enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861 and died at Corinth, Mississippi, March 23, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 333.

<sup>77</sup> A. B. Speir, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, and was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 658.

them is able to be out. There is others complaining which we think are taking the Measles. Capt. Rogers<sup>78</sup> adjoining us has 25 in the hospital, and Capt. Richardson<sup>79</sup> has about 40 in the hospital. We dont send our boys to the hospital. I dont hear of any company's in Camp Moore thats suffering half as bad as the Phoenix Rifles, Ouachita Southern<sup>80</sup>, and the Simmon Stars.<sup>81</sup> I Reckon you have heard of the Death of our friend J. W. Cross.<sup>82</sup> His remains was escorted home by Capt Taylor,<sup>83</sup> H. H. Ham<sup>84</sup> and J. T. Mayfield.<sup>85</sup> No one of our company could be more missed than Cross. He had every attention paid to him that could be. We nurse our sick boys very Close. I have learned to be a good nurse and a good Cook too. I have so much of both to do that I cant help learning how. Our orderly Seargeant is also Sick and I have all his business to attend to, and so when night come I can sleep as sound on the hard plank as I ever could on a feather bed, but all my hard work agrees with me. I wish I could send you some of my biscuits. I think Mother would give it up that I could beat her. It is given up that I am the best cook in the company. I dont have any war news to write you, for we don't get the papers like you do. I dont know when we

<sup>78</sup> Madison Rogers was at that time Captain of Company E, Field and Staff, 17th Louisiana Infantry, having enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861. He was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel on May 23, 1862. After December 20, 1862, he was "absent on court martial, Special Order No. 62, from Lt. Gen. Pemberton." This is the last entry in his record. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 375.

<sup>79</sup> It is somewhat difficult to identify this man from entries in the records. He probably refers to Robert Richardson, who is listed in the records as First Lieutenant of Company D, 17th Louisiana Infantry, having enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861. He was later absent for a time in Virginia, but was back in Louisiana or Mississippi early in 1863, was captured at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863, and was subsequently paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, June 9, 1865, as Colonel of the 17th Louisiana Infantry. However, the writer may refer to either of two other Richardsons in the 17th Regiment. T. P. Richardson was commissioned Surgeon, Field and Staff, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on October 22, 1861—two days after this letter was written—though he may have been acting in the emergency before commission was issued. He was present with the regiment at Camp Chalmette, Louisiana, in November, 1861, and at Camp Corinth, Mississippi, in March, 1862, with which date his service record ends. W. H. Richardson was commissioned Assistant Surgeon, Field and Staff, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on October 22, 1861, and was promoted to Surgeon on June 6, 1862, after the reorganization of the Regiment at Edwards Depot, Mississippi. He was present with the regiment until February, 1863, when entries in his service record cease. Neither of these three men is listed as "Captain" in the records, but the raw recruit may have been a little indefinite in the matter of ranks of his superiors. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, pp. 312-313.

<sup>80</sup> The "Ouachita Southrons" were Company A, 17th Louisiana Infantry. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 14.

<sup>81</sup> The "Simmons Stars" were Company G, 17th Louisiana Infantry. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 15.

<sup>82</sup> See footnote 51, above.

<sup>83</sup> Jordan Gray Taylor was Captain of Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry. See footnote 46, above, and "Introduction" to these letters.

<sup>84</sup> H. H. Ham was Sergeant in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at this time. He enlisted at Camp Moore on September 31, 1861, but was reduced to the ranks from Sergeant when he re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862. He is later listed in the records as a Drummer, until he was captured and paroled at Vicksburg, July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 163.

<sup>85</sup> J. T. Mayfield enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, was sick in the General Hospital after March, 1862, and died at Columbus, Mississippi, May 15, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 929.

will leave here, but it [is] certain that when we do leave we will go to N. O. We have Regimental drill twice every day, and Sunday and Thursday is our days for dress Parade. Our Regt has got its flag and took it out this evening for the first time. I had the honor of bearing it in the Regt and Saluting old Tracy<sup>86</sup> with it. Ours is the company that bears the flag in the Regt. I wish you could see us on our dress Parade days. It is beautiful to see two Regts all uniformed with their guns and two fine flags in a march behind their Music. It makes a fellow feel like fighting. I send you a letter that I Rec from Wm<sup>87</sup> yesterday. I am sorry to hear of the dispute about the ring. I am in hopes there will be no hard feeling about it. I want you to inform all the girls that Jeff is at Camp Moore and is all right on the goose. A letter from any of them would be very exceptible. It ant worth while for me to tell where the ring come from. It is growing late in the night. I must close my letter. I want you and all the rest to write to me often. Starling<sup>88</sup> has never drap me a line since here I have been. I must call the roll and go to bed. Good bye Sallie.

Your Brother Jeff

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Moore La Oct 24th 1861 Tangipahoa Pa[rish]  
Jordan G. Taylor Jr:

Dr Brother I take pleasure this evening to write you a few lines to inform you that I am yet enjoying fine health, in fact I am in better health than I ever was. Our boys that have had the Measles are all getting on foot. We have Several new cases on hand. Sil Joiner,<sup>89</sup> Cleat Boatright,<sup>90</sup> and several others have Just began to change their color. They have been complaining for Several days but have just begun to break out. No other

<sup>86</sup> He probably refers to Captain M. O. Tracey, Field and Staff, 13th Louisiana Infantry, who appears to have been, at different times, in command of Companies A, B, D, and E of that regiment. He was from New Orleans, and had enlisted at Camp Moore on September 11, 1861; was wounded at Murfreesboro, December 31, 1862, and was on sick leave at Winchester for some time thereafter. He appears never to have fully recovered from his wound, but was sent on detached service to Mobile by order of General Braxton Bragg, from July to December, 1863, during which time he appears to have been promoted to Major. He was absent on sick leave from January to the end of August, 1864; and from October, 1864, to April, 1865, he was absent on recruiting service in East Louisiana and Alabama, by order of General Hood. His name is on the Register of Prisoners of War, Taylor's Corps, paroled May 18, 1865. Records describe him as follows: "Age 31 years, eyes blue, hair light, height 5 ft. 10 in." Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 858.

<sup>87</sup> William C. Lee, brother of the writer, who was then serving in the Confederate forces in Virginia. See "Introduction", above.

<sup>88</sup> Starling C. Lee, another brother of the writer.

<sup>89</sup> See footnote 48, above.

<sup>90</sup> Listed in the records as W. C. Boatright, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and died at Camp Chalmette, Louisiana, November 1 or 4, 1861. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 18.



sickness among us at this time. Capt Taylor<sup>91</sup> Returned on yesterday Morning with six recruits for our company. Also Capt Ham<sup>92</sup> arrived with a fine company of boys from Union. We have been very lively since they come. Union Parish is well Represented at Camp Moore, there is about 185 volunteers at this place from Union. I will be proud to see our boys all get well one more time. In Making out my Report today, I reported 29 of our company unable for duty. Our company numbers 90 rank and file. I reckon you have heard of the *Leesburg Battle* which resulted in our behalf. If the Yankees attack N.O. they will get the worst flailing that they have ever had. N.O. is prepareing every day for its defense. Men who have been to N.O. say that the Yankees can never touch bottom. Jord I must quit writing for I have no more news to write. I Suppose you have no candidates in Union for Representative. Its a pity that some of them cant volunteer. I want you to give me a full account of the Election when it comes off. Jord if I keep fatening like I have for the last two weeks I will get to be a whale after a while. Give my Respects to the connection and all enquiring friends especially to mmm you know. Jeff. Write to me often.

E.J. Lee

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Moore Nov 15th 1861 Tangipahoa Pa La

Jordan G. Taylor Jr:

Your letter of 10th Inst came to hand this morning through James Beaird<sup>93</sup> and was Rec and read with pleasure. I have nothing of importance to relate, more than usual. I never was in as good health as I am now. My weight is 160 lbs, 22 lbs hevier than I was when I came to Camp Moore. Our company are all able to be up and will soon all be able to do duty. I believe the Soldiers here have about run through the Measles. There is no other sickness here that I hear of. I Recived all the articles that you sent me. I am under many obligations to you for such a great favor. Tell Aunt Sallie Gary<sup>94</sup> that I Rec the gloves that she knit for me. Tell her that I never shall

<sup>91</sup> Jordan Gray Taylor was Captain of Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry. See "Introduction" and footnotes 46 and 83, above.

<sup>92</sup> Hillory H. Ham is listed in the records as having been elected Captain of Company E, 19th Louisiana Infantry, on October 13, 1861, and enlisted in the Confederate service at Camp Moore on December 11, 1861. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 163.

<sup>93</sup> See footnote 49, above.

<sup>94</sup> Probably a relative of the recipient of the letter.

forgot such favors as that, and I do hope that I will see the day when I can return the favor. Jord I have been thinking that I would come home at Christmas, but you must not look for me, for I dont know where we will be by that time, but my opinion is we will stay here all the winter, though circumstances alters cases. There is no telling where we will go when we leave here. I can hear 20 different tales here every day. I want to see Starling when I come home, and if I go at Christmas I wont get to see him, but if life lasts and I can get a furlough I will be at home sometime between Christmas and the first of March. The 19th Regt has been organized here since I wrote to you and only lacks one company of being completed. B.L. Hodge<sup>95</sup> of Caddo Parish is Col, Hollinsworth<sup>96</sup> of Desoto Parish Liut. Col, Butler<sup>97</sup> of Bosier Parish Maj. There is three Regts here lacking one company.<sup>98</sup>

Yesterday was a great day with us. We was visited by *Brig Gen Lovell*<sup>99</sup> of New Orleans. The Soldiers all put on their uniforms and marched to Tangipahoa to meet him. We was there Drawn in lines and presented arms to him as he got off the cars. He come up here to take a view of the camp and to inspect our arms, and to see if we were well enough Drilled to fight the Yankees. He said we performed very well. The 16th Regt is well Drilled, much better than ours. The 16th has had the best Drill officers in the State. Our Liut Col and Maj has not been with us but very little, and our Col has had it all to do. This is reason why the 16th Regt is better Drilled than ours. It is late at night

<sup>95</sup> Benjamin L. Hodge appears from the records to have been Captain of Company I, 19th Louisiana Infantry, at first; but he was elected Colonel of the 19th Regiment on November 11, 1861, and was inducted into the Confederate service on December 11, 1861. He was absent from his regiment in the latter part of December, 1861, being sick and under medical attendance in New Orleans. He resigned from the service and went home on May 29, 1862, but his resignation was not formally accepted until July 15, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 322.

<sup>96</sup> James M. Hollingsworth appears to have been Captain of Company F, 19th Louisiana Infantry, but he was elected Lieutenant Colonel of that regiment on November 11, 1861. He resigned from the service on May 8, 1862, said resignation becoming effective on May 13, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 338.

<sup>97</sup> Loudon Butler was at first Captain of Company B, Field and Staff, 19th Louisiana Infantry, which entered the Confederate service at Camp Moore on December 11, 1861. He was promoted to Major on May 8, 1862, while on sick leave, and was not immediately assigned to duty; and was promoted to Lieutenant Colonel of his regiment on July 15, 1862. He was killed on September 20, 1863, and was succeeded by H. A. Kennedy. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 204.

<sup>98</sup> These were the 16th, 17th, and 19th Louisiana Infantry, the last of which lacked one company of being complete.

<sup>99</sup> Mansfield Lovell was in command of the forces defending New Orleans from the threatened Federal attack.

and I must quit writing. Give my Respects to all my Relations and enquireing friends.

I remain as ever your friend and brother

E.J. Lee

P.S. One of Joel Heaths sons<sup>100</sup> come Down with James Beaird and Joined our Company. E J Lee

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Moore La Nov 23d 1861

Jordan G. Taylor:

Jord I embrace the present opportunity of dropping you a few lines which I hope will reach safely to you through *Dr. Baker*.<sup>101</sup> The prospect of leaving here is very good. A Dispatch come to *Col Heard*<sup>102</sup> yesterday to hold his Regt in readiness to March at an hour's warning to *New Orleans*. *Dr Simmons*<sup>103</sup> came up last night on the 11 o'clock train, and brought news that we will be ordered to Columbus Ky. So it is uncertain where we will go, but I am certain that we will not stay here long. The 13th Regt will be sent to Columbus from N. O. That makes me think we will go there too. I think we ought to go some where to help our Southern boys, for I view our Confederacy at this time in a gloomy condition. The leading men here say that there is certain to be two or three big fights in a few days, and these fights may Deside the matter.

I think the notions of the Federals are to make a big effort at several places, thinking to whip us, and then we would give it up, but no sir they will have to kill all the southern boys and then we wont be whiped. We have got men enough in the field to whip them if we only have a half chance. Tell Mother I rec her's and Sudy's<sup>104</sup> letter yesterday, and was read with pleasure. I would answer it but have not time now nor hav'nt had since I Rec it, for we drill here all the time except when we are cooking and eating. I think Starling has certainly forgotten me. He has not drop me a line since I have been here. You must write to me

<sup>100</sup> Probably J. T. Heath, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on November 15, 1861. He re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, but the entries in his service record end with December 31, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 244.

<sup>101</sup> It is impossible to identify this man as a member of the writer's military organization. There were several "Bakers" enlisted as privates in the 17th Louisiana Infantry, and this gentleman was probably the father of one or more of them. The records list no "Dr. Baker" as a surgeon in any of the regiments then at Camp Moore.

<sup>102</sup> S. S. Heard was Colonel, Field and Staff, of the 17th Louisiana Infantry. He enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, but the records in his case end with March, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 241.

<sup>103</sup> There were several men named "Simmons", both officers and privates, in the 17th Louisiana Infantry; but none of them is listed as a surgeon. This man may have been a member of the same regiment with the writer, or he may have been the father of one or more of the men, and had merely come to Camp Moore to visit them.

<sup>104</sup> Probably a sister of the writer.



often, but you wont know where to write if we leave here untill we are located. I went to the Dr this morning and got him to vaxinate my big arm. I hear that the Small pox is in the northern army, and I dont want to have it. I must close for I am in a hurry. Excuse bad writing.

Yours as ever

E.J. Lee

P.S. Since writing the above we have got orders to be ready by 9 o'clock tomorrow morning. E.J.L.

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Chalmette 7 miles below N. O. Nov 30th 1861.

J.G. Taylor, Farmerville La:

Jord we arrived here on the 27 Inst about 4 o'clock P.M. We were smartly wearried when we got here. It was a warm evening and we had to march from the depot a distance of 10 miles. Some of the boys came very near faging. Jord we are at the spot where Gen Jackson whiped Packanham.<sup>105</sup> This is a very pleasant place in dry weather, but in wet weather the dirt Sticks like praire. We are out reach of wood and water, but I suppose we will have wood and water hall to us in a few days. My health is very good. This is the only Regt that is here at this time, but there will be a brigade formed here so I suppose. The 16th Regt will be here tomorrow, and the 19th will also be here in a week or two. Jord I wish you could see our fortifications here. The Yankees can never touch bottom here without it is after we sink thier vessels. W.A. Darby<sup>106</sup> paid us a short visit last evening. He and *Dan Payne*<sup>107</sup> can give you all the news. Starling will be down in a few days. Jord you must write to me and give me all the news.

I am in a hurry and I must quit.

Yours as ever

Jeff

Address me as follows: E.J. Lee New Orleans La Care of Col S.S. Heard Co. C 17th Regt La Volunteers

<sup>105</sup> Camp Chalmette was located on the battlefield where General Andrew Jackson defeated General Sir Edward Packenham in the Battle of New Orleans, January 8, 1815.

<sup>106</sup> F. B. Darby (also listed in the records as T. B. Darly) and P. W. Darby were both privates in Company K, 16th Louisiana Infantry. W. A. Darby was probably a relative of these two men, who came to visit them in camp.

<sup>107</sup> Dan M. Payne enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, and was apparently a corporal from the date of his enlistment. He was absent on furlough from November 30 to December 29, 1861, and was detained longer at home by severe illness. He re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, at which time he was promoted from First Corporal to Second Sergeant; was promoted to Sergeant Major on October 26, 1862; was captured at Vicksburg, July 4, 1863 and was finally paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, June 18, 1865. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 88.

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Chalmette La Dec 6th 1861

Jord I in haste to night drop you a few lines. Since I wrote to you the position of our company in the Regt has been changed. Our company has been letter C but we are now letter D. Hon Frank Fuller<sup>108</sup> and Judge Taylor<sup>109</sup> arrived here to day from Baton Rouge, and brought news that Starling was sick. Fuller thinks that he has got the Jaundice. Starling sent me word that he would be down to see me in a few days if he got no worse. The 16th Regt arrived here last Sunday. The 19th will be here in a few days.

There will be a brigade formed here consisting of 5 Regts to guard the City. The health of our company is very good. My own health was never better. I am fatning every day. I get plenty of Sugar cane to chaw down here. I hear that the small pox is in the city but I dont feel uneasy for I have got a big sore on my arm from Vaxination. It is late at night so no more from

E.J. Lee

Direct your letters as follows: E.J. Lee New Orleans La Care of Capt Taylor Phoenix Rifles 17th Regt Co D

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Corinth Miss March 4th 1862

J. G. Taylor,

We arrived here on the 2d Inst and dont know when we will get away. The right wing of our Regt. has moved to Henderson's Station on the Mobile and Ohio R.R. a distance of 40 miles. There has been no train going up since we came here. We lay over at Jackson<sup>110</sup> one day and night. Our company had only been gone one day when we got here. The left wing of our Regt is here, the 19th is also here and 4 Ala. Regt's. The 16th and 18th are on Tennessee River, the 18th had a fight with two Yankee

<sup>108</sup> J. Frank Fuller was elected state senator in 1861 from the district composed of Union and Jackson parishes. The Louisiana Legislature met in Baton Rouge on Monday, November 25, 1861, and it was customary for many of the members to visit New Orleans during the week-end recesses. *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, November 23, 1861.

<sup>109</sup> Probably J. Taylor, who was one of the two representatives—S. C. Lee being the other—elected as members of the house of representatives from Union Parish in 1861. *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, November 23, 1861.

<sup>110</sup> Jackson, Mississippi, may be meant. It was on the New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern Railroad which had been completed to Canton, Mississippi, thirty miles north of Jackson, at the outbreak of the war. Or the reference may be to Jackson, Tennessee, about ninety miles east of Memphis.

gun Boats. They killed 15 of the Yankees and taken three prisoners. Our loss was 4 killed and 9 wounded. Jord it is a cold day so I wont write no more until I get to our company. My health is tolerable good.

E.J. Lee

A word to Mother: I come with your old friend *Rater Hawthorn*<sup>111</sup> here yesterday also Aron Ingram a son of old Lovero Ingram.<sup>112</sup>

E.J.L.

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Corinth, Miss March 29th 1862

J.G. Taylor,

Dear sir it is with pleasure that I embrace the present opportunity of writing to you again.

I have been sick for the last 8 days, my health is now improving but I am very weak. I have had something like Measles. We have but two cases in our company thats any ways bad, but we have many puny boys unable for duty. James Beaird<sup>113</sup> died this morning of Typhoid Fever. He was sick about twelve days. We hated to give him up but his case seemed to be an unquorable one. Two others have died in the hospital out of our company since I came here. We only staid at Henderson one week after I came. We came back to Corinth and only staid one day before we was ordered to make a force march towards Tenn River. We staid out five days, it was a trip of exposure, we waded mud and water all day (the first day). That trip is what made me sick. I have had the worst cold that I ever had. We are now in camps one mile from Corinth. I hope I will soon get stout again.

I hear that the Yankees are in ten miles of us with a large force. We are making a Rapid progress to fight them, we are fortifying daily for our defense. We have lots of men here and plenty of arms of all kinds. Rations was drawn yesterday for 110000 infantry, besides we have an immense quantity of cavalry. We have a good supply of Artillery.

I saw one of your Uncle Bob Taylor's son's here yesterday, he is in the 17th Ala Reg't. You have a cousin Randolph Darby in the 18th Ala Reg't. Tell Mother that I find lots of her old

<sup>111</sup> Probably a member of the 4th Alabama Regiment mentioned in the letter. The Lees of Union Parish, Louisiana, had moved there from Alabama in the middle 1840's.

<sup>112</sup> See the preceding footnote.

<sup>113</sup> See footnote 49, above.



Ala acquain[tan]ces here. There is a company of cavalry here from Carloville. I hear that there is a company from Butler Co in the 22d Ala Regt.<sup>114</sup> I have not seen none of them yet.

Mr Wessbrooks<sup>115</sup> is here so I suppose. He is in the 11th La. Regt.

I think some of our Farmerville Recruits are getting badly home sick.

Doty<sup>116</sup> has gone home, they are at liberty to go back when they please, for they go on their own hook as high Privates. Tell Wm<sup>117</sup> to call on me as he goes back and stay a day or two. Jord I am very anxious to hear from [you?]. I have not Rec a letter since I came. I may have a letter a[t] Henderson, but write to me at Corinth untill you are otherwise ordered. Write to me soon and give me all the news.

E.J. Lee

E.J. Lee Corinth Miss

Care Capt Taylor 17th Regt La. Vols Co. D

*E. Jefferson Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor*

Corinth, Miss Apr 4th 1862

To Mrs Sallie C. Taylor:

Dear Sister I have the opportunity this morning of writing you a Short letter, and you must not be astonished when I say that I have nothing that will interest you. I am sorry to say that my health is not good. I have had the Diarrharr [diarrhea] for three weeks and a bad cold with it. But I have not had any fever at all. I am very weak but I am able to be up all the time.

I feel much better this morning than usual. The Dr has checked my bowels and I am still taking Medicine. I have to be very particular in what I eat. I have almost starved for the last week. I think it is the water that we use that causes so much sickness among us. We lost another good boy last night making the 4th one that's died since I have been here, Viz J.H. Chun,<sup>118</sup>

<sup>114</sup> Many of the prominent families of Union Parish, Louisiana, came from Alabama in the middle 1840's and after, when the hill parishes of North Louisiana were being rapidly settled.

<sup>115</sup> Uriah Westbrook was Captain of Company E, 11th Louisiana Infantry, having enlisted at Camp Moore on August 18, 1861. The record of his service ends with October 31, 1861. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 1047.

<sup>116</sup> No person of this name, which fits this description, is listed in the records. The editor of the letters may have incorrectly transcribed the name.

<sup>117</sup> William C. Lee, a brother of the writer, was then serving in the Confederate forces in Virginia. Apparently he was at home on furlough, or was expected home at this time; but the records indicate that he was then sick in a Virginia hospital. See "Introduction", above.

<sup>118</sup> See footnote 76, above.

James Beaird,<sup>119</sup> S.B. Ford,<sup>120</sup> D.L. Peak.<sup>121</sup> We have about twenty boys that's unable for duty. We sent nine of them to the Hospital at Holly Springs Miss.

Our Regt started yesterday on another force march, towards the Tenn River. There was only about 400 of the Regt able to go. The balance are sick. They will be gone five Days. I was not able to go with them. We puny boys are left here in charge of the tents. Dr. Baker<sup>122</sup> and Mr. Trimble<sup>123</sup> is with us. Sis we have a large force here, there is over one hundred thousand soldiers here. We have sent about 40,000 thousand on a force march Towards the Tenn River.

The Yankees are on the River. Gen Buel<sup>124</sup> it is said is at Savanah a little town on the River about 30 miles from here. Our forces are trying to get the Enemy away from the River. We have large forces all the way from Grand Junction to Florence. If we can only get the Yankees away from the River it will be good bye to Buel and his army, they will have to fight or go back to big waters soon, for the Tenn. River is falling so fast that they cant navigate with their gun Boats. Gen Beauregard<sup>125</sup> is in command of our forces that's gone on the force march. Gen's Johnson [Johnston]<sup>126</sup> and Bragg<sup>127</sup> are here. Col Jesse Pearson<sup>128</sup> and Dick Cooper<sup>129</sup> came to see me yesterday.

<sup>119</sup> See footnote 49, above.

<sup>120</sup> S. B. Ford enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, was promoted to Sergeant later (date not given in the records), and died at Corinth, Mississippi, March 19, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 895.

<sup>121</sup> D. L. Peak, a private in Company D (originally C), 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and died on April 4, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 96.

<sup>122</sup> See footnote 101, above.

<sup>123</sup> The records do not list any man by this name as connected with the military units then at Corinth, Mississippi. He may have been merely a visitor in the camp.

<sup>124</sup> Don Carlos Buell was in command of a part of the Federal forces operating on the Tennessee River at that time.

<sup>125</sup> Pierre Gustave Toutant Beauregard was one of the outstanding General's contributed by Louisiana to the Confederate service. Fifteen different Louisiana military units were named for him. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 7.

<sup>126</sup> Albert Sidney Johnston was one of the prominent Confederate Generals during the first year of the war. He was killed in the Battle of Shiloh, a few days after this letter was written.

<sup>127</sup> Braxton Bragg was a prominent General from Louisiana in the Confederate service. Three military units were named for him. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 7-8.

<sup>128</sup> Reference appears to be to Jesse M. Pearson, and the title, "Colonel" seems to have been only a nickname. The records list a man by this name as having enlisted as a private in the Wirt Adams Cavalry (Company B), at Little Rock, Arkansas, on August 25, 1861, from which organization he was transferred to Company C or D, 17th Louisiana Infantry, April 30, 1862. He re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, but retired from the service, December 19, 1862, having hired J. L. Ross as a substitute. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 93.

<sup>129</sup> The records list numerous "Coopers" in the various military units then stationed near Corinth, Mississippi, some of them from Union Parish and others from neighboring parishes; but none of the names can positively be identified as fitting this individual. However, the "Dick" may have been a nickname, or the man mentioned may have been merely a visitor to the camp.

The Col looks fine. He is stout and robust. His company is only about two miles from us. I am looking for Wm every day.<sup>130</sup> He certainly will call on me. I Rec his letter a few days ago. His is the only letter I have Rec from home since I have been here. I may have letters at Henderson. You must write to me at Corinth hereafter untill you are otherwise ordered. I sent Jord 20 Dollars by Dr Spears<sup>131</sup> which I hope will reach him safe. Li[e]ut. Sawyer<sup>132</sup> is at Henderson yet. We left him there very sick. The last news we heard from him was very unfavo[r]able. I fear that he will die.

I have written all the news so I will close. My leaf is fill. Give my love and Respects to all my friends and acquainteces. Adieu for the present.

E.J. Lee

[The following was written on the top margin of the second page of the letter:]

Tell Jord and the boys<sup>133</sup> not to enlist, for they dont know anything about soldiering. I did not know any thing about it untill I came up here.

Jeff

Tell Rufus to write to me how he is getting on farming.

*E. Jefferson Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor*

Corinth Miss Sunday Apr 20th 1862

Sallie I Rec your's and Jord's letters on Friday: and have omitted answering till now as Mr. Odom<sup>134</sup> is going home tomorrow I will send you a few lines. He can tell you more than I can write. My health improved for some time after I wrote you, but I taken the mumps and been very poorly every since. I have also a pain in my left hip joint which has disable me from walking. The Dr says it is Rheumatism. That tale you spoke on me is a false one and I want you to give it the lie. Such words never come from my mouth.

Excuse me for the present.

Your brother

Jeff

<sup>130</sup> See footnote 117, above.

<sup>131</sup> Probably a friend of the Lee and Taylor families, who had paid a visit to the camp. There were some "Spears" boys listed as being in the same regiment with the writer, and others by that name in other commands then at Corinth, Mississippi.

<sup>132</sup> Samuel Sawyer, First Lieutenant, Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861. The last entry in his service record reads: "Present on all Rolls to April, 1862." Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 461.

<sup>133</sup> Reference is doubtless to the writer's younger brothers who were still at home.

<sup>134</sup> See footnote 60, above.



*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

· Edwards Depot Miss May 20th 1862

Jordan G. Taylor:

It has been so long since I wrote to you that I am almost ashamed to write, but I now have the opportunity and I will make one more faint attempt. I reckon you have heard of our Regt being at Vicksburg, i.e. we are not [at] Vicksburg now, but we are on the R.R. 18 miles from Vicksburg at Edwards Depot.<sup>135</sup> Jord I have been in very bad health ever since Dr Baker<sup>136</sup> left us. I was sick when we left Corinth and was sick all the way. After we got to Vicksburg I stayied in camps one day and night and had high fever all the time, and could get nothing done for my relief. I then went back to Clinton to the Hospital 10 miles this side of Jackson. There I found the best people I ever saw. My Physician at the Hospital I think was a splendid one, who soon broke my fever and give me a box of pills that has cured my bowels.

I stayed in the Hospital 6 days, and Returned to camps yesterday. I am improving very fast, in fact my health is better now than it has been in two months. The Ladies in Clinton was very kind to me. They visited the Hospital every day, and bring me soup and butter milk and every thing that was nourishing. There is a fine female school there of 70 young Ladies and the prettiest I ever saw. They came to see me every day and would bring me fine boquets. I tell you I mended fast. Ask Sally if she dont think that was a good place for a sick Soldier. If ever I get out of this war I think I will have to go to Clinton to get a w——. Jord I am very anxious to hear from home. I wish you would come to see me. It wont cost you much time nor money. If you cant come write to me and give me all the news. Tell me what the conscript Law<sup>137</sup> is doing among you. I dont want you and Henry<sup>138</sup> to leave home if there is any other chance. I dont see any use of a conscript Law for the South cant arm the men that's now out. Capt Taylor<sup>139</sup> will go home in a few days as a

<sup>135</sup> Edwards Depot, Mississippi, was the point at which the 17th Louisiana Infantry was reorganized on May 23, 1862, following the fighting at Shiloh and Corinth.

<sup>136</sup> See footnote 101, above.

<sup>137</sup> The Confederate Congress passed a Conscription Act on April 16, 1862, which required all white men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five to serve for three years in the Confederate Army unless the war ended sooner. *Statutes at Large of the Confederate States*, 1 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 30.

<sup>138</sup> Henry C. Lee, a brother of the writer, had already enlisted in the Confederate service at Monroe, Louisiana, on May 14, 1862, approximately a week before this letter was written. *Booth, Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, pp. 704-705.

<sup>139</sup> Jordan Gray Taylor was Captain of Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry. See footnote 46, above.

Recruiting officer. Our Regt will Reorganize next Saturday. I will stop writing for present. Give my Respects to all enquiring friends.

Write to me at Edwards Depot, Hindes County Miss. Adieu  
E.J. Lee

*Henry C. Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Jackson Miss Nov 25th 62

Dear Brother J:

I write you a few lines to inform you of my whereabouts health &c. We are at this time about one (1) mile South of Jackson but we will stay here but a few hours longer.

We have marching orders for some point b[e]tween this and Holly Springs. We will take the cars to morrow morning. My health is not very good. I had fever yesterday and day before but I am clear of fever to day and I feel tolerably well. I dont know whether I will go with the company or not. They say they will leave all the sick at this place. I recon I will go. I wrote you a letter the day we got to this place. I am anxious to hear from home. I have not heard from home since I saw you. Dont be uneasy about me, I think I will be well in a few days. My hand is very nervous. I cant write more. Give my love to Mother and family. I cant tell you where to address me yet till I get to a stopping place. Perhaps letters would be forwarded to me from Jackson. I recon the 31st will try her spunk in a few days. No more at present.

From Henry C. Lee

Inclosed are a few lines to Mrs S.H. Taylor.<sup>140</sup> Please hand it over.

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Ouachita Near Vicksburg Dec 7th 1862

J. G. Taylor:

Sir I seat myself this sabbath evening to write you [a] few lines, which leaves me in tol[e]rable health. I wrote to Mother the day after I got here, but you may get this before she gets hers as I will send this to Monroe by hand. I stood my trip well, though I had a muddy time of it. I was mustered into service yesterday morning by *Lt Col M. Rogers*.<sup>141</sup> *Col. Richardson*<sup>142</sup> has gone home to marry. He married on the 5th Inst to Miss

<sup>140</sup> Probably a near relative of J. G. Taylor, Jr., to whom the letter is addressed.

<sup>141</sup> Madison Rogers was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel of the 17th Louisiana Infantry on May 23, 1862. See footnote 78, above.

<sup>142</sup> Reference is probably to Robert Richardson, Colonel of the 17th Louisiana Infantry. See footnote 79, above.

Fanny Gaston. She lives on Washita River below Monroe in Caldwell Parish. She is worth Sixty Thousand Dollars. Bro Henry<sup>143</sup> is sick at this time with Jaundice. The 31st Regt is very sickly, for the last three nights they have lost Seven men out of the Regt. Our Regt is in better health than it ever was, our boys looks healthy, and are in fine spirits. Our Regt is well drilled and dissiplened. The we[a]ther is fair and cold. The 31st Regt are not in fine spirits, those that are not down sick are greiving themselves to death about home. I want you to send my shoes to me by the first chance. As you have nothing to do untill a new year you had as well come and b[r]ing me some meat. We dont get any thing to eat but corn bread and beef. The boys say that they have not had any flour or coffee since I left so you know it is hard liveing. Our beef is old and very lean, we Just have to boil it and it dont make any sop. Steve Beaird<sup>144</sup> & Leander McFarland<sup>145</sup> has written home for some hog meat, and we want you to put it all in a box and bring it to us. We will help pay expenses on you and the box.

I brought all the baggage through safe that I started with. I found all my Winter clothing in the Regt that I left here last summer. Mr Odom<sup>146</sup> started with my coat and vest but I met him and got them.

I give Henry<sup>147</sup> my hood and a pair of pants so tell Mother that Henry says he has got enough pants. I wrote to William<sup>148</sup> today. Col Richardson<sup>149</sup> says any man shall have a furlough to go home if he wants to marry. You may tell the gals that they may look out, for the boys have desided that they will have to make Sold[i]ering a profession and they say that they will marry and go at it right. But you come and bring us boys our meat and we will be satisfied without marrying for a while. Be sure and come. Nothing more.

Yours Respectfully,

E. J. Lee

<sup>143</sup> Henry C. Lee, a brother of the writer. See footnote 138, above.

<sup>144</sup> S. J. Beard in the records. See footnote 40, above.

<sup>145</sup> Probably the man listed in the records as M. L. McFarland, who enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 28, 1862 was promoted to Second Sergeant on November 7, 1862, was subsequently promoted to Junior Second Lieutenant of Company C, 2nd Louisiana Infantry, was captured at Vicksburg on July 4, 1873, and was finally paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, June 30, 1865. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, III, Book 1, p. 1189.

<sup>146</sup> See footnote 60, above.

<sup>147</sup> Henry C. Lee, a brother of the writer. See footnote 138, above.

<sup>148</sup> William C. Lee, a brother of the writer, who was then sick in the hospital at Danville, Virginia. He was soon thereafter discharged from the service for disability, on December 16, 1862. See "Introduction" to these letters.

<sup>149</sup> See footnote 79, above.



E. Jefferson Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor

Camp Ouachita Near Vicksburg Miss Dec 23d 1862

Mrs. Sarah C. Taylor:

Dear Sister I send you a few lines by Mr Clayton<sup>150</sup> to let you know how I am getting along. I should have written to you by Charly Rabun,<sup>151</sup> but I was not in camps when he left. I am in good health and have been ever since I come to camps. Henry is getting well of his Jaundice, he is reported for duty. I reckon he will be transferrd to our company in a few days. I have got the papers fixed up and all approved Ready to send to Gen Smiths Head quarters.<sup>152</sup> The health of our company and Regt is fine, we have but very few sick men at this time. The 31st is yet very sickly. Lieut Fitzgerald<sup>153</sup> died a few days ago as you have doubtless heard.

Hiring Substitutes appears to be the order of the day here. Jacob Shlenker<sup>154</sup> and Col Jessee Pearson<sup>155</sup> have both got substitutes, and Abe Cann<sup>156</sup> is trying to hire one. I reckon he will succe[e]d.

We was reviewed on Sunday last by Jeff Davis and Gen Joe E. Johnson [Johnston]<sup>157</sup>. I took a good look at old Jeff. He is a calm looking old fellow. Gen Johnson is a fine looking officer. I have been looking for Jord for seve[r]al days. Tell him to come and bring us something to eat, for we are very near starved out on beef. He may be holding back on account of the Small Pox, but I tell you there is no Small Pox here, nor hasnt been. If you will send us some meat, I will send you and Mother some factory cotton.

<sup>150</sup> Probably the father of J. C. Clayton, a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry. See footnote 53, above.

<sup>151</sup> See footnote 52, above.

<sup>152</sup> Henry C. Lee, a brother of the writer, had enlisted at Monroe, Louisiana, May 14, 1862, in Company H, 31st Louisiana Infantry, and was transferred to Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, on January 1, 1863, by order of Major General M. L. Smith. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 705.

<sup>153</sup> William C. Fitzgerald, First Lieutenant of Company H, 31st Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Monroe, Louisiana, May 14, 1862, and died at Vicksburg on December 19, 1862. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 857.

<sup>154</sup> Jacob Shlenker enlisted as a private, Field and Staff, Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861, and was assigned to duty as Quartermaster Sergeant on the same day. He re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, and retired from the service on December 2, 1862, having hired R. J. Stewart as a substitute. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 553.

<sup>155</sup> See footnote 128, above.

<sup>156</sup> Listed in the records as A. A. Cann and Abe A. Cann, who had enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 29, 1861. He appears not to have succeeded in hiring a substitute, for he is still listed as present on the rolls to February, 1863; and the official rolls of pardoned officers lists "A. A. Cann", Captain of Company F, 2nd Battalion, Heavy Artillery, paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, June 20, 1865, after the close of the war. This is the only "Cann" listed in the records. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 241.

<sup>157</sup> General Joseph E. Johnston was one of the Confederate officers in command of the troops in the vicinity of Jackson, Mississippi, at this time or a little later, prior to the siege of Vicksburg.

I have no war news to write more than you know. We have whiped the Yankees at Frederickburg mighty bad. Times are still here at this time. We are still preparing for the Yankees every day at this place. I hope we will be able to give them a warm Reception. Our fortifications here are sublime.

I hear no talk of any Christmas here, every thing appears to be still on that question.

You must write to me often. I have not Received a letter from home yet. Nothing more at present. Adieu

Your Bro

E. J. Lee

*E. Jefferson Lee to Jordan G. Taylor, Jr.*

Camp Ouachita Near Vicksburg Jany 4th 1863

J. G. Taylor:

Sir I write to you once more to inform you how I am getting along. I am in good health at this time, though I am very much wearied from our trip on the Yazoo River.

We have been from camps nine days and have just got back. We had two fights with the Yanks and come out victorious in both fights. Some of our troops fought 4 or 5 days, but our Regt only ingaged them twice. We only lost one man out of our company and [he] was the only one out of the Regt, and that was Joe Clayton.<sup>158</sup> Poor fellow he was a brave soldier. He dared danger. The last words that I heard him say was come on boys who is afraid of the Yankees. It was not long after he spoke those words before a six pound cannon ball struck him in the eye and tore off one side of his head. He never knew what killed him, for he never breathed. The ball was opened on Saturday 27th *Ult.* by our company while we was on picket. Joe was the first man that fired a gun, and was killed that evening. The fight was going on all day Sunday but we was not engaged any more until Monday. About two o'clock, the Yanks moved on our breast-works and was repulsed with a pretty heavy loss. We taken 400 prisoners. Our loss was very light. I shot 36 rounds at the Yankees. Our troops are in fine spirits. We dont have any idea of giving up Vicksburg. Our force here is pretty strong, troops are coming in every day.

Henry is well. He was in all the fight and never got hurt. I hear that the 31st fought splendid.

<sup>158</sup> See footnote 53, above.

John B. Robinson's son<sup>159</sup> was killed early in the action. He was shot through the head. I hear that the Yanks have burned the Rail Road Bridges out to Delhi.<sup>160</sup> I am in a hurry and I must close.

I again request you to write to me and let me know what you are doing this year, and whether or not the men are called in to camps up to 40. Nothing more

To J. G. Taylor Farmerville

E. Jeff. Lee

*Henry C. Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor*

Camp Ouachita near Vicksburg Miss Jan the 21st 1863

Dear Sister I write you a few lines in haste this ev[e]ning which leaves me enjoying very good health at this time and I sincerely hope this may find you all enjoying the same blessing. Bro Jeffs<sup>161</sup> health is verry good also. He will write to Some one of the Family this ev[e]ning. As I have not written since the battle I will try to give you a small account of it. We left camps on Friday ev[e]ning about 4 oclock P. M. Marched till 9 in the night when we all fell down on our blankets. The most of us soon rocked of[f] to dreamland however we were not allowed to enjoy the sweetest of opiates long. It soon began to rain and I guess we had a time of it. The ground where we was is soon all afloat with water so we had to stand up the balance of the night. You may depend on it day light was a welcme visitor however we did not fare much better for its rained the most of the day. About 8 o'clock A M there was about 200 negro[e]s came to dig us a breastwork to stand behind but before they got it completed the Yankees opened fire on us when you ought to have seen the niggers skedadle from there. We were soon in trenches flat of our you know what snug as fleas in a sheep skin for the Yanks over shot us considerably however it behooved a fellow to keep his head as low as pos[s]ible. I forgot to state that

<sup>159</sup> Reference appears to be to the boy listed in the records as "S. W. Robinson", who enlisted as a private in Company G, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on September 30, 1861, and re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862. The last entry in his service record is for October, 1862: "Present, under 18 years of age." Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 358.

<sup>160</sup> Delhi, Louisiana, was on the Vicksburg, Shreveport, and Texas Railroad, which had been completed from the Mississippi River west to the Ouachita River at Monroe, Louisiana, at the outbreak of the war. Grant was at this time trying to cut off supplies coming to Vicksburg by this railroad.

<sup>161</sup> E. Jefferson Lee, a brother of the writer. Both were now in the same company. See "Introduction" to these letters.



the first volly the Yanks fired killed Sidney Robinson<sup>162</sup> a Son of John B. Robinson. They fired on us for three days and a half. We repulsed them in every charge they made on our earth works with heavy loss. The 31st fought from 2 to 4000 men and come out with a loss of 9 killed and 16 wounded so you see we come out remarkably well. Ther[e] was 2 men wounded in our co (H) Capt Farmer<sup>163</sup> S. B. Briggs<sup>164</sup> severely in head A. N. Green<sup>165</sup> slightly in head. I will now proceed to give you a little shaking down. You certainly have not forgotten that you had a brother Henry in the army although it seems strange that he never hears from you. Perhaps you have no pen ink nor paper. If I thought it was so I would divide with you however I recon it is neglect more than anything else. Tell Jord I intend this for him and Sudy<sup>166</sup> as much as to you. If you have not got any paper nock round amongst the neighbors and try to get enough to write me a short letter and charge it to my account. I hope you will take this all in good humor for it is written in good humor. I forgot to tell you that the Yanks come verry near hitting me. They come so near it they shot through my blanket and it was wrapt around me. I recon you are getting tired of reading this foolishness and I am tired of writing it so we will stop it. My love to mother and Family. Reserve a basket full for your self and divide the balance among the GIRLS. Nothing more at present from

Henry

P S If you have no money to pay postage dont let the chance slip of sending them by such men as John Phelps.<sup>167</sup> Henry.

<sup>162</sup> See footnote 159, above.

<sup>163</sup> W. W. Farmer, Captain of Company H, 31st Louisiana Infantry, enlisted at Monroe, Louisiana, May 14, 1862, was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863, and was apparently exchanged at Vienna, Louisiana, about April 1, 1864. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 811.

<sup>164</sup> Squire B. Briggs enlisted as a private in Company H, 31st Louisiana Infantry, at Monroe, Louisiana, May 14, 1862. The records state that he was wounded severely in the head on Sunday, December 28, 1862, and that he was promoted to Fourth Corporal on January 1, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, II, 116.

<sup>165</sup> Andrew N. Green is listed in the records as a private in Company H, 31st Louisiana Infantry. He was wounded slightly in the head on Monday, December 29, 1862, was later captured at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863, and was finally paroled at Monroe, Louisiana, June 12, 1865. His residence is given as Claiborne Parish, Louisiana. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 90.

<sup>166</sup> Probably a sister of the writer. See footnote 104, above.

<sup>167</sup> Probably a friend of the family, who had a son in the same company with the writer.

E. Jefferson Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor

Parole camp 10 miles south Shreveport

Jan 22nd 1864

Sallie I Rec yours tonight. I was glad to hear from you and the family. The boys all got here safe. I have nothing to write you in reply, but I Just drop you a few lines in answer to your letter. I am in better health than I ever was. My weight is 164 lbs. We have been living fine since the boys left us.

We taken a bate of our fine Turkeys today that Mrs. Kilgore<sup>168</sup> sent us. We had a very cold spell of weathers but we stood it like good Solders.

One of Jessee Lee's<sup>169</sup> Daughters married about two weeks ago. I did not go to wedding. She married a *Capt* Scott.<sup>170</sup> Old Jessee's youngest son (David)<sup>171</sup> is in the cavalry, and is here with us. I see him every day. He is fine looking man.

I am sorry to hear of Mary Darby's<sup>172</sup> Illness.

It is late at night and will close. Excuse bad writing. Give my Respects to all hands, especially to my ———.<sup>173</sup> Write soon

Your

Jeff

E. Jefferson Lee to Mrs. Sallie C. Taylor

Camp 17th La Infantry Near Alexandria Aug 26th 1864

Sister Sallie:

I send you a few lines by Frank<sup>174</sup> which leaves me in the best of health. I have fattened like a pig ever since I have been here. Henry is also well. He *Rec* your letter and haver sack that you sent. I have no news to write. Times are dull here. Some of our boys are sick. W.D. Regan<sup>175</sup> and Harvy Thomas<sup>176</sup> are at

<sup>168</sup> Probably a friend, who may have had a son in the same camp.

<sup>169</sup> Apparently a relative of the Lee family of Union Parish, who resided in Caddo Parish, at or near Shreveport. See footnote 171, below.

<sup>170</sup> It is impossible to positively identify this bridegroom from the records, as Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, lists at least thirteen men by the name of "Scott", all with the rank of "Captain".

<sup>171</sup> David R. Lee, residence Caddo Parish, Louisiana, was a private in Company A, 6th Louisiana Cavalry, who was one of the prisoners of war paroled at Shreveport on June 8, 1865. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 1, p. 704.

<sup>172</sup> The Darby family of Union Parish were relatives of the Taylors.

<sup>173</sup> This symbol probably refers to the writer's sweetheart back home, who was well known to his sister.

<sup>174</sup> Probably a member of the Lee family, who was visiting in camp.

<sup>175</sup> W. D. Regan was a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, who was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 274.

<sup>176</sup> Harvey Thomas enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on October 23, 1861, and re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862, when he was promoted to Third Corporal. He was later promoted to Sergeant, and was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, Vol. III, Book 2, p. 808.

the seminary Hospital.<sup>177</sup> Hub Ham<sup>178</sup> and Willis Austin<sup>179</sup> are in camps but are not able for duty. There are 22 of our company that are not exchanged. I am on detail for a week's guard duty in Alexandria.

We get a plenty of Beef and corn bread to eat, and sometimes a little bacon and Molasses. It is thought by a great many that the Trans-Mississippi army will be sent to Atlanta Ga, if we can cross the Miss River.<sup>180</sup> I wish that all the troops in this department was over there, if so we could end the war in a short time. We cant hear of a Yankee force any where only in Ga & Va.

We have 50,000 Soldiers in this department. If they were in Ga and in Sherman's<sup>181</sup> rear he would not know what hurt him. Taylor's<sup>182</sup> army is now at Harisonburg.<sup>183</sup>

Look in the wallet that I send and you will find a pair of Shoes a pair of Socks and a cap, besides an old Shirt and an old pair pants. The Shoes, Socks, and cap, is what I drew yesterday. I also drew a pair of pants and a Shirt, but I have kept them, and sent my old pants and shirt home. You will please convey them to mother's for her to take care of.

I will close for this time. Give my love to all, and write soon

Your Bro

Jeff

<sup>177</sup> Reference is probably to the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy near Alexandria, which was used as a Federal military hospital after General Banks' Red River Campaign. Walter L. Fleming, *Louisiana State University, 1860-1896* (Baton Rouge, 1936), 126.

<sup>178</sup> See footnote 84, above.

<sup>179</sup> Willis Austin enlisted as a private in Company C, 17th Louisiana Infantry, at Camp Moore on February 11, 1862, and re-enlisted at Edwards Depot, Mississippi, May 23, 1862. He was captured and paroled at Vicksburg on July 4, 1863. Booth, *Louisiana Confederate Records*, I, 92.

<sup>180</sup> After the Federal capture of Vicksburg, Mississippi, and Port Hudson, Louisiana, in July, 1863, it was very difficult for the Confederates to transport troops from the Trans-Mississippi Department to the eastern theaters of conflict.

<sup>181</sup> General William Tecumseh Sherman was at this time closing in on Atlanta, Georgia.

<sup>182</sup> General Richard Taylor, one of the prominent Louisiana generals supplied to the Confederacy, was in command of troops in North Louisiana during the latter part of the war.

<sup>183</sup> Harrisonburg, Louisiana, the parish seat of Catahoula Parish, is located on the Ouachita River south of Monroe. During the war Fort Beauregard was erected there to prevent the Federal gunboats from going up the river.



# THE POLITICAL CAREER OF THOMAS OVERTON MOORE, SECESSION GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA\*

By VAN D. ODOM

## CHAPTER I

### ANCESTRY, EARLY LIFE, AND PUBLIC CAREER PRIOR TO 1860

Birth—genealogy—comes to Rapides Parish—buys plantation—marriage—police juror, 1842-48—State Representative, 1848—State Senator, 1852—reelected State Senator, 1857—career as State Senator.

Thomas Overton Moore, the fourteenth Governor of the State of Louisiana, and the last one elected prior to secession from the United States, was born April 10, 1804, in Sampson county, North Carolina.<sup>1</sup> The son of James II and Jean Overton Moore, he was a descendant of men who had been the champions of freedom both in America and in Ireland. On his father's side he was a descendant of Roger Moore, leader of the Irish Rebellion of 1641.<sup>2</sup> John Moore, his great-grandfather, emigrated from Ireland in the seventeenth century to what is now North Carolina, and later became Governor of the Carolinas.<sup>3</sup> The family was so distinguished in its patriotism during the American Revolution that a county in North Carolina was named in its honor.<sup>4</sup> When a Committee of Public Safety met at Wilmington, North Carolina, in July, 1775, James Moore I, grandfather of Thomas Overton Moore, represented Duplin county as a delegate to that meeting.<sup>5</sup> In September, 1775, he was appointed a Second Major in charge of the militia of his native county,<sup>6</sup> and a short time later was promoted to the rank of First Major and made a commander of all the militia from the Newbern and Wilmington districts.<sup>7</sup>

The mother of Thomas Overton Moore was a daughter of Thomas Overton who served in the Revolution under General

\* Master's Thesis in History, Louisiana State University, 1942.

<sup>1</sup> Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (editors), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1928-1936), XIII, 138.

<sup>2</sup> *The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 29 vols. (James T. White and Company, New York, 1898-1941), X, 78.

<sup>3</sup> *Genealogy of Moore Family*, in possession of Mrs. Shirley Bruce Staples, Alexandria, Louisiana.

<sup>4</sup> *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, X, 78.

<sup>5</sup> *Genealogy of Moore Family*.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

Robert E. Lee's father. Major Overton served throughout the American Revolution and was present at the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.<sup>8</sup> A maternal uncle of Moore, General Walter H. Overton, was an aide to General Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans.<sup>9</sup> The Overton family was very closely associated with Andrew Jackson. Two other uncles of Moore, Judge John Overton and General Thomas Overton, were close friends and neighbors of Jackson during his early days in Tennessee. Judge Overton was an eminent jurist of the Supreme Court of that state, and the successor to Jackson in this position. He was the first in Tennessee to make written opinions in legal cases.<sup>10</sup> General Thomas Overton, for whom Thomas Overton Moore was probably named, served as a second in one of Jackson's duels in Tennessee.

Moore's early life was spent in his native state of North Carolina. Little is known of his educational advantages, but it may be presumed that he had a better than average education for a man of his day. In 1829 he came to Rapides parish and assumed the management of his uncle's plantation located in that parish.<sup>11</sup> It was fortunate for Moore that he could become associated with so influential a man as was his uncle. After the peace which ended the War of 1812, General Walter H. Overton purchased a plantation in Rapides Parish and soon enjoyed the reputation of being one of the larger cotton planters in Louisiana. That General Overton was an able and popular man in the state of his adoption is evidenced by the many public offices which he held. After coming to Rapides he was to serve as Police Juror, Court House Commissioner, a member of the Louisiana House of Representatives, and Representative in Congress after 1829.<sup>12</sup>

General Overton's nephew, plantation manager, and protégé soon proved himself to be an able businessman. In November, 1830, Moore purchased from Sosthene A. Ballio a tract of land comprising 500 arpents, "lying and being in the Parish of Rapides on the left bank of Bayou Robert in descending, and adjoining lands of James D. Spurlock above and lands of Mrs. Sample below," for the sum of \$7,500. The aspiring young plantation

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> G. P. Whittington, "Thomas Overton Moore, Governor of Louisiana, 1860-64," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XIII (1930), 5-10.

<sup>10</sup> John S. Bassett, *The Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1925), 63; John S. Bassett (editor), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*, 6 vols. (Washington, 1926), II, 1.

<sup>11</sup> *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, X, 78.

<sup>12</sup> Whittington, *loc. cit.*, XIII, 5-10.

owner obligated himself to pay for this land by signing three promissory notes of \$2,500 each, payable annually from the date of March 15, 1831.<sup>13</sup> Soon after this purchase the landholdings of Moore were increased by the property which his wife, Bethia Leonard, had at the time of her marriage to him. Mrs. Moore owned the plantation known as "Emfield" and also a number of slaves.<sup>14</sup> In March, 1832, Moore purchased an additional 400 acres adjoining his plantation, from James D. Spurlock.<sup>15</sup> Six years later, Moore homesteaded 274.90 acres adjoining the tract owned by him.<sup>16</sup> These last two purchases, together with the land purchased in 1830, probably constituted the plantation which was called "Mooreland".

Within a few short years, by good business judgment and wise management, Moore found himself the owner of two large plantations in one of the most fertile parishes in Louisiana. Although cotton was the principal crop grown, Moore's experience as a farmer had taught him the wisdom of cultivating an ample supply of foodstuffs for his family, his slaves, and his farm animals.<sup>17</sup> It was not until 1852 that Moore was to engage in the cultivation of sugar cane on a large scale. However, he proved himself to be as successful in sugar culture as he was in cotton production.<sup>18</sup>

Seven years after Moore began the cultivation of sugar cane on a large scale, he was the second largest sugar planter in his parish, with a crop of 1,261 hogsheads; and in 1860, with a crop of 1,085 hogsheads, he was the largest sugar planter in Rapides Parish.<sup>19</sup>

Having established himself as a successful planter and businessman, Moore was destined to serve his parish in various elective positions in the years to come. In 1842 he was elected a member of the Parish Police Jury, in which position he served for the next six years.<sup>20</sup> No records are available whereby he may be appraised as to his success as a member of that body; but one may assume that his services in this position were highly satisfactory, as he was elevated to a higher position by his constituents.

<sup>13</sup> Land Sale Record, in possession of Mrs. Shirley Bruce Staples, Alexandria, Louisiana.

<sup>14</sup> Whittington, *loc. cit.*, XIII, 5-10.

<sup>15</sup> Land Sale Record, Mrs. Staples, Alexandria, Louisiana.

<sup>16</sup> Homestead Certificate, *ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> Whittington, *loc. cit.*, XIII, 5-10.

<sup>18</sup> P. A. Champomier, *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana in 1851-52* (New Orleans, 1852), 1.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, (1858-59 and 1859-60), 1.

<sup>20</sup> Whittington, *loc. cit.*, XIII 5-10.



In 1848, Moore was elected a member of the State House of Representatives from Rapides Parish.<sup>21</sup> During this session of the General Assembly he was appointed a member of the Committee on Public Lands.<sup>22</sup> In the election of a United States Senator, Moore supported Duncan F. Kenner who was opposed by John Slidell.<sup>23</sup> However, on the first ballot for this honor the vote was a tie, and thereupon the final election was postponed. When the Legislature resumed consideration of the matter, the name of Pierre Soulé was substituted by the Democrats for that of Slidell; and on the second ballot Moore supported Soulé, who won by a comfortable margin.<sup>24</sup> Although he was a Democrat, Moore, like several other members of his party, seemed unwilling to vote for Slidell as candidate for the United States Senate.

It seems that Moore was not only active in representing the people of his parish, but also those of an adjoining parish. He requested and was granted permission to read a petition from the citizens of Avoyelles residing on the north bank of Red River, asking to be attached to the Parish of Rapides.<sup>25</sup> On January 24, Moore voted favorably on a resolution empowering the Speaker of the House to appoint a committee of five to examine the books of the State Treasurer and the Auditor, and to make a full report to the House on the same.<sup>26</sup> Later in the session, he was appointed on a special committee to act upon a memorial presented by the Police Jury of Rapides Parish.<sup>27</sup> In the election of a State Printer, Moore supported Peter K. Wagner who won by a vote of 64 to 62;<sup>28</sup> and for State Treasurer he supported Joseph Walker, the Democratic nominee, who was elected.<sup>29</sup>

Representative Moore voted to table a bill which would have permitted charitable institutions to administer the property of minors in certain cases.<sup>30</sup> On February 2, he was appointed on a committee of five to study the report of the State Engineer and make a report to the House when the study had been com-

<sup>21</sup> *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIII, 138-139.

<sup>22</sup> *Louisiana House Journal* (1848), 21.

<sup>23</sup> Although Kenner was a Whig and Slidell a Democrat, it is possible that Moore supported the former because of his distrust of Slidell and the part he had in the Plaquemines Fraud. This was a scheme whereby the electoral vote of Louisiana went to James K. Polk instead of Henry Clay in 1844.

<sup>24</sup> *Louisiana House Journal* (1848) 28.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 69.

pleted.<sup>31</sup> On February 13, Moore introduced a bill granting certain taxing powers to the Police Jury of Rapides Parish.<sup>32</sup> By the terms of this bill, which was later enacted into law, the Rapides Police Jury was empowered to levy a land tax, the proceeds of which were to be used for the construction of a system of levees on that part of Red River which was within that parish.<sup>33</sup>

During his first session in the Legislature, Moore was not especially prominent as a lawmaker. In most instances he voted with the Democratic majority on questions of public interest. He was faithful in the performance of the duties of his office, there being no evidence in the *House Journal* that he was absent for a single day during the entire session.

In December, 1848, the Legislature was convened in special session for the purpose of providing financial support for the public school system which had been instituted a few years before. During this short session of twenty days, Moore gave his vote for all measures designed to appropriate money for the operation of the public schools.<sup>34</sup>

Moore did not represent Rapides Parish in the House during the session of 1850. It is not known whether he was a candidate to succeed himself and was defeated, or whether it was because he did not offer himself as a candidate. However, he continued to take an active interest in politics, both state and national. He was a delegate to the State Democratic Convention which met in Baton Rouge in March, 1852.<sup>35</sup>

In 1851 Moore offered himself as a candidate for the State Senate, and was one of the two senators elected from the Avoyelles-Rapides senatorial district. On January 19, 1852, he took the oath of office and assumed his position in the upper chamber of the General Assembly.<sup>36</sup> W. F. Griffin was his senatorial colleague during this session. The new senator cast his first vote on a motion that all committee members in the senate be elected by that body. He voted for the motion, but it was defeated.<sup>37</sup> This may account for the fact that he was not appointed a member of any committee during the session.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>33</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1848), Act 25, p. 15.

<sup>34</sup> *Louisiana House Journal* (Special Session, 1848), 19.

<sup>35</sup> *Baton Rouge Advocate*, March 16, 1852.

<sup>36</sup> *Louisiana Senate Journal* (1852), 8.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 21.

Moore, a staunch Democrat, throughout his public life was a strong advocate of public education. In the early days of the session of 1852 he gave notice that on a future day a bill would be introduced by him to locate the State Seminary of Learning in Rapides Parish.<sup>38</sup> However, the honor of introducing the bill which did locate that institution in his parish did not go to Moore, but to his colleague in the House, Representative Ryan of Rapides. Ryan served notice in the House on January 21 that he would introduce such a bill, and on the following day Moore served notice in Senate of his intention of introducing such a bill in that body. When Moore learned of Representative Ryan's action, he did not introduce his proposed bill. However, when the measure came before the Senate, Moore did all he could to see that it received favorable action in that body.<sup>39</sup> Later in the same session a bill was proposed which would have located the State Seminary of Learning in Baton Rouge, but Moore was successful in having this bill indefinitely postponed.<sup>40</sup>

In the election for United States Senator, Moore cast his vote for the successful candidate, Judah P. Benjamin.<sup>41</sup> Why he supported Benjamin, one of the outstanding Whig leaders of the state, is problematical; however, in this instance he may have supported the candidate whom he regarded as best qualified for the position, without regard for strict party politics.

Moore was appointed on a special committee of three to study and report a plan for readjusting the judicial districts of the state.<sup>42</sup> During the session of 1852 he introduced a bill authorizing a survey of the boundary line between the parishes of Rapides, St. Landry, and Calcasieu. He likewise by legislative enactment attempted to have the levees in his home parish surveyed and rebuilt. Much discussion and heated debate developed over a bill which would have prohibited a master from freeing a slave until a sum of \$150 had been deposited with the Parish Treasurer, such fund to be used to defray the expenses of deporting the freedman to Liberia. When the bill came up for final passage, Moore cast his vote with the majority and the measure was defeated.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>39</sup> Letter, "T. O. Moore to D. Martin," March 10, 1852, in *Red River Republican*, located in the Alexandria, Louisiana, Public Library.

<sup>40</sup> *Louisiana Senate Journal* (1852), 36.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 36.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.



Moore's participation in state politics ended temporarily with the adjournment of the legislative session of 1852, and was not to be resumed until five years later. In the state elections of 1857 he was a successful candidate for the Senate, and was to represent Rapides Parish in that capacity for the next two years. He was present on the first day of the new session, took the oath of office and was sworn in as a member of the senate.<sup>44</sup> In electing a Secretary of the senate, he voted for Aristides Babin, and for Assistant Secretary of that body he cast his ballot for Oscar Arroyo.<sup>45</sup> Moore nominated his neighbor, W. F. Griffin, the senator from Avoyelles, for president *pro tempore* of the senate and was successful in having him elected to that position.<sup>46</sup>

Moore's absence from the lawmaking body for a period of six years does not seem to have diminished his popularity or his ability as a statesman, for he served as a member of several of the most important senate committees, being chairman of some of them. He was appointed chairman of the Committee on Finance, served as a member of the Federal Relations Committee, and also on the Committee of Commerce, Agriculture, and Manufactures.<sup>47</sup>

It appears that Thomas Overton Moore took the lead in having the State Seminary of Learning established on a permanent basis. Having been influential in locating this institution in his parish, he lost no time in the session of 1858 in proposing legislation designed to give this school a permanent form of government. On the second day after the General Assembly convened, Moore introduced a bill the object of which was "to organize a plan of Government of the Louisiana State Seminary of Learning." Under the terms of the proposed act the school was to have a Board of Supervisors composed of fourteen members appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the senate. Each member of the board was to serve for four years and was removable at the pleasure of the appointing power. It would authorize and empower the Board of Supervisors to (1) engage a President and such other professors as were necessary, to fix their salaries, to remove them, and to hire such other officers as might be necessary to conduct the institution; (2) to establish rules and regulations of discipline for

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.* (1858), 3.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>46</sup> *Baton Rouge Advocate*, January 28, 1858.

<sup>47</sup> *Louisiana Senate Journal* (1858), 4.

the cadets; and (3) to prescribe a course of study. A feature of this bill establishes Moore as a sound believer in democratic education. It would provide that the State Seminary should admit annually sixteen indigent cadets, who were to be given four years of education gratis. These cadets should be not less than fifteen years of age, and not more than one might be appointed from any parish, Orleans excepted. The appointment of these cadets was to be vested in the Governor.<sup>48</sup> This measure, with certain amendments, was later enacted into law.<sup>49</sup> A few days later, Moore introduced a bill providing for an appropriation of \$30,000 for the completion of the physical plant of the Seminary. He was successful in having this bill referred to the Finance Committee, of which he was the chairman, which returned it to the senate with a favorably report.<sup>50</sup>

Senator Moore sponsored another measure to further the cause of public education. This measure would authorize the principal of the Marksville High School to confer literary degrees upon students of the school who met certain scholastic requirements.<sup>51</sup> He served as chairman of a special committee whose duty it was to make a report upon the advisability of installing an artificial gas lighting system in the state capitol. When the time came for the election of a United States Senator, Moore was urged by his friends to permit his name to be placed in nomination.<sup>52</sup> However, he refused the honor and cast his vote for Judah P. Benjamin, a recent convert to the Democratic party, who won the election, receiving 59 votes to 55 for the combined opposition.<sup>53</sup> He also followed the decision of the Democratic caucus when it became necessary to elect a President of the Senate following the resignation of Lieutenant-Governor Charles H. Mouton. W. F. Griffin, his colleague from Avoyelles, obtained the nomination and was elected, receiving 16 votes to 9 for his opponents.<sup>54</sup>

A resolution was introduced in the senate, favoring repeal of the law enacted by Congress which forbade the importation of slaves after January 1, 1808.<sup>55</sup> Moore opposed this resolution, and when a later bill was introduced, permitting the importation

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>49</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1858), Act 28, p. 159.

<sup>50</sup> *Louisiana Senate Journal* (1858), 6.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 51.

<sup>52</sup> *Baton Rouge Weekly Advocate*, February 13, 1859.

<sup>53</sup> *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, March 3, 1859.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> *Louisiana Senate Journal* (1858), 102.

of 2,500 Negroes to serve as apprentices for life, he cast an unfavorable vote on this measure. Why he took this attitude when he was a large slaveholder is problematical. Possibly he felt that any increase in the number of laborers in Louisiana would decrease the value of his slaves. Moore was absent from the senate from January 28 to February 8. During his absence a resolution was proposed which would condemn the action of the United States for sending a military force to Nicaragua to arrest General William Walker, a citizen of Louisiana who was leading a revolutionary movement in that Central American country. The resolution was referred to the Federal Relations Committee of which Moore was a member. The debate which ensued was very spirited, but when it came to a vote the resolution was carried by a comfortable margin. If Moore had been present during the action on the resolution, it is probable that he would have cast his vote with the majority. By request, he introduced a bill granting Isaac Martin the franchise to operate a ferry on the Atchafalaya River at its junction with Old River.<sup>56</sup> On February 27 Moore introduced a bill providing for taking a census of the population of portions of the parishes of Rapides, Sabine and Calcasieu, with the purpose of creating new parishes from this area.<sup>57</sup>

Thomas Overton Moore was to attend one more session of the senate before his term of office expired. Because no *Senate Journal* of the session of 1859 is available and the newspaper reports of the work of the General Assembly are *nil*, it is not possible to place an accurate estimate on his record in this session. However, there is little doubt that he was at his best as an able legislator and the acknowledged leader of his associates during this session. During his service as representative and senator, Moore had proved himself a man of honor, integrity, and one skilled in statecraft. He was soon to be chosen as standard-bearer of the Democratic party in Louisiana, as its next candidate for the office of Governor.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 73.



## CHAPTER II

## MOORE'S ELECTION AND FIRST YEAR AS GOVERNOR (1860-1861)

Rivalry of Soulé and Slidell in state politics—method of electing delegates to the Democratic State Convention—Odd Fellows' Hall meeting, April 4—State Democratic Convention—refusal of the Convention to seat Soulé delegates—Moore's nomination for Governor—Soulé delegates call a convention to nominate a rival candidate for Governor—Thomas J. Wells nominated as Moore's opponent—comments on gubernatorial race—results of the election—Moore's inauguration—address to the Legislature—Governor's opinion on slavery question—legislation enacted by the General Assembly—Lincoln's election as President.

*Background of the Election*

With the ascendancy of the Democratic party in state politics after 1845, there sprang up two factions within its ranks. These factions did not disagree over the question of slavery or Congressional control of slavery, but because of the rivalry between the two leading Democrats in the state—John Slidell and Pierre Soulé.<sup>1</sup> This rivalry first came into the open when, in 1848, the Legislature elected Soulé to the United States Senate over his Democratic rival, Slidell.<sup>2</sup> However, in 1853, when President Franklin Pierce appointed Soulé as minister to Spain, the Legislature elected Slidell as his successor.<sup>3</sup> Upon his return from Spain in 1855, Soulé set about to organize an opposition to the dominance of Slidell in the political affairs of the state. In the election for Governor in 1859, Slidell and Soulé each placed a candidate in the race.

When the Legislature adjourned on March 18, 1859, it had been suggested that the State Democratic Convention should convene on May 3 in Baton Rouge.<sup>4</sup> As the date for the Convention approached there arose a discussion as to the method of choosing the delegates. A plan had been proposed, providing that on the day of the election for an Associate Justice of the State Supreme Court a special ballot box should be placed at each voting precinct in order that in this way the voters might elect the delegates to the Convention.<sup>5</sup> The *Weekly Advocate* protested loudly

<sup>1</sup> Baton Rouge *Weekly Advocate*, February 13, 1859.

<sup>2</sup> Lilla M. McLure, "Election of 1860," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, IX (1926), 614.

<sup>3</sup> Amos A. Ettinger, *The Mission to Spain of Pierre Soulé, 1853-1855* (New Haven, 1932), 150-151.

<sup>4</sup> James K. Greer, "Louisiana Politics, 1845-1861," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XIII (1930), 451.

<sup>5</sup> Baton Rouge *Weekly Advocate*, February 13, 1859.

against this proposal, claiming that under such a plan everyone, regardless of his party affiliation, would have a voice in electing delegates to a strictly party convention.<sup>6</sup> The *Advocate* came forward with the suggestion that the Parish Democratic Committees should designate a day when the voters of each ward would meet and elect delegates to represent them in the Parish Convention; and these ward delegates could in turn elect parish delegates to the State Convention.<sup>7</sup> This plan was finally adopted as a means of electing delegates solely from the ranks of the Democratic party.

The dissension in the party was made quite evident when Soulé called for a meeting to be held in Odd Fellows' Hall in New Orleans for the purpose of organizing the Democratic party in that city.<sup>8</sup> When this meeting convened on April 4, Soulé appeared before the delegates and delivered an address in which he said: "As I conceive it, we have to fight against but a single enemy, official interference and corruption."<sup>9</sup> That Soulé and his faction were desirous of securing votes from any and all sources was shown by the card which was printed immediately following the meeting of April 4. It read as follows:

DEMOCRATS! WHIGS! AMERICANS!

FOR GOVERNOR

MAJOR ANDREW S. HERRON<sup>10</sup>

One newspaper was very critical of the meeting of April 4, observing that from the nature of the resolutions submitted and adopted the meeting was not called for the purposes which were first stated.<sup>11</sup> Nor were some of the country parishes prone to accept the action of the meeting as true to Democratic principles. A resolution which was passed by the Democrats of St. Landry asserted that the New Orleans meeting was intended to create dissension and division in the party and that it deserved "the just censure of every loyal Democrat."<sup>12</sup> The followers of Soulé held another meeting in New Orleans on May 14, for the purpose of electing independent delegates to the State Convention to be held on May 25 in Baton Rouge.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> McLure, "Election of 1860?" *loc. cit.*, IX, 615.

<sup>9</sup> *Baton Rouge Weekly Advocate*, April 19, 1859.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> McLure, "Election of 1860," *loc. cit.*, IX, 620.

<sup>12</sup> *Baton Rouge Weekly Advocate*, April 10, 1859.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, May 1, 1859.

The newspapers opposing the "Souléites" raised the question of why the meeting of the 14th was not postponed until May 16, the regular time for the election of delegates, when their claims to being the legitimate Democrats could be established, by the best of all tests, the unqualified approval of the masses of the party.<sup>14</sup> Likewise, there was dissension among the party followers as to whether the voters of the state should approve the meeting of May 14 in New Orleans.<sup>15</sup> In an article headed, "What will we do about it?" the *Weekly Advocate* said:

We mean the question of admitting into the approaching Democratic State Convention a set of delegates to be irregularly chosen on the fourteenth instant in the city of New Orleans who stand committed by the record of their public acts to the squatter sovereignty doctrines of Stephen A. Douglas.<sup>16</sup>

In reply to this article the New Orleans *Daily Crescent* commented: "Confound the squatter sovereignty doctrines of Stephen A. Douglas, confound Douglas himself! What have either to do with the State of Louisiana? What? Not a thing!" One voter, writing to the *Weekly Advocate*, said: "The track is clear for politics—purificators and Slidell miscreants—nothing can occur to change the *casus belli*. . . ."<sup>17</sup>

Prior to the meeting at Odd Fellows' Hall all names had been suggested that might be placed on the ticket at Baton Rouge on May 25. A Democratic state ticket was suggested by an "Old Liner"<sup>18</sup> in a letter to the *Weekly Advocate*, with Honorable Thomas Overton Moore heading the ticket as candidate for Governor. Commenting on this proposal of a state ticket, the *Gazette and Comet* said: "The King (Slidell) has been here and made his mark. That we should feel it through the Free State of Franklin.<sup>19</sup> by an Old Liner does not surprise us."<sup>20</sup> So numerous were the names of prospective candidates to head the ticket that the *Monroe Register* commented: "We fear that it will be impossible to elect them all at the next election."<sup>21</sup>

Thus the stage was set for the State Convention which was to meet in Baton Rouge on May 25. The split in the Democratic

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, May 15, 1859.

<sup>16</sup> New Orleans *Daily Crescent*, May 12, 1859.

<sup>17</sup> Baton Rouge *Weekly Advocate*, April 17, 1859.

<sup>18</sup> A nickname for the followers of Slidell.

<sup>19</sup> Supposedly meaning Franklin Parish.

<sup>20</sup> Baton Rouge *Gazette and Comet*, April 17, 1859.

<sup>21</sup> *Monroe Register*, as quoted in Baton Rouge *Weekly Advocate*, April 3, 1859.



party was openly avowed. Either Slidell would continue to rule and dominate the party in Louisiana with the aid of his Old Liners, or Soulé would be successful in wresting the scepter from "King John", and the New Liners would taste the nectar of success.

#### *The State Democratic Convention*

As scheduled, the State Democratic Convention met at high noon on May 25, 1859, in the city of Baton Rouge. There was a very large attendance, and every parish in the state except Vermilion was represented on the convention floor.<sup>22</sup> When all the delegates were assembled, B. W. Pierce of Bienville Parish nominated W. W. Pugh of Assumption as temporary chairman, and Charles H. Mouton nominated General G. W. Munday of East Feliciana for the same position. There followed a huge demonstration for each of the proposed candidates, and it was finally agreed that the two men would jointly occupy the temporary chairmanship.<sup>23</sup> Having elected a temporary chairman, the Convention was addressed by Emile LaSere, chairman of the State Central Committee. He outlined, by order of said committee, the attitude which it recommended that the Convention adopt in regard to the Odd Fellows' Hall meeting of April 4 in New Orleans. In the course of his address, Mr. LaSere made the following charges: (1) That the meeting was not called by the Democratic voters of New Orleans, but by one hundred and one men, some of whom were not from the Parish of Orleans; (2) That the meeting was not authorized by the State Central Committee, nor was that committee consulted in issuing the call for said meeting; (3) That the meeting denounced the authority of the State Central Committee, and the chairman of the meeting was a citizen and resident of an adjoining parish, who had no authority to act in any capacity as a resident or voter of the Parish of Orleans; (4) That the meeting adopted a resolution endorsing the squatter sovereignty theory, and should the delegates named by the Odd Fellows' Hall meeting be admitted to seats in the Convention, this resolution would forthwith become the opinion of the entire Convention. In closing, Mr. LaSere said:

If those who vindicated squatter sovereignty at the Odd Fellows' Hall knew what they did, they are not fit political associates for Southern men. You will be called upon to decide between them and us. We have no fear of the re-

<sup>22</sup> Baton Rouge *Weekly Advocate*, May 29, 1859.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

sult. With an abiding confidence that it will prove that the Democracy of this State stands steadfastly for its time-honored usages, and holds fast to the great principles, from which it has never deviated, we submit this controversy to those who are its best and only judges.<sup>24</sup>

Following the address of Mr. LaSere, a committee was appointed to pass upon the credentials of the delegates. The Convention then adjourned to await the report of this committee. The Convention was called to order at 9 P.M. on May 26, and T. C. Manning of Rapides reported the findings of the Committee on Credentials. He reported that all parishes except Vermilion were represented by delegates or by proxies. Further, the report stated that the parishes of Livingston and St. Bernard, and all the precincts of New Orleans, except the ninth and eleventh, were represented by two sets of delegates. The Committee referred this matter to the Convention for a decision.<sup>25</sup>

The Convention then proceeded to the election of a permanent chairman, W. W. Pugh of Assumption being accorded the honor by a majority of two votes. Chairman Pugh then appointed a committee of five to examine and report on the contested seats. A majority report of this committee recommended that the delegates elected at the Odd Fellows' Hall meeting not be admitted to the Convention as delegates. A minority report favored the seating of both sets of delegates; however, the majority report was accepted by the Convention. The delegates having been duly recognized, Mr. LaSere moved that the Convention proceed to the nomination of a candidate for Governor. Zebulon York of Concordia and A. L. Tucker of St. Mary nominated Thomas Overton Moore of Rapides. Six other nominations were submitted, to wit: (1) Henry Phillips of DeSoto, (2) W. F. Griffin of Rapides, (3) S. F. Marks of New Orleans, (4) A. S. Herron of East Baton Rouge, whose name was withdrawn at his request, (5) L. V. Reeves of Tensas, and (6) W. W. Pugh of Assumption.<sup>26</sup>

It appears that the nominees were aware of the necessity of repudiating the meeting at Odd Fellows' Hall before their names would be given favorable consideration for the ticket. Accordingly, when the nominations for Governor had ceased, a letter from each of the nominees was read repudiating the Odd Fellows'

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

Hall meeting and denouncing specifically the doctrine of squatter sovereignty as endorsed by said meeting.<sup>27</sup>

That the contest among the candidates was heated is evidenced by the fact that not until the sixteenth ballot was any nominee able to muster a sufficient majority to be declared the victor. There being 218 votes in the Convention, it was necessary that the successful candidate should receive 110 votes in order to be declared the nominee. On the first ballot Moore ran second to Phillips, who received 73 votes to 71 for Moore. On the third ballot Moore gained in the race, leading with 77½ votes to 77 for Phillips. On each successive ballot there was a change in the lead between Moore and Phillips, until the fifteenth, when the count stood, for Moore 98½ and for Phillips 93. Before the result of the sixteenth ballot was announced, S. F. Marks of Orleans, on behalf of the delegation from West Feliciana, changed the vote of that parish from Marks to Moore, and the delegation from St. Tammany switched its votes from Marks to Moore. So evident was the trend of voting that C. B. Mills of Assumption moved that the Convention go on record as electing Thomas Overton Moore as the Democratic nominee for Governor, by a unanimous vote.<sup>28</sup> After completing the nominations of other candidates who were to appear on the ticket with Moore, the Convention adjourned on May 27, 1859.

The delegates who had been rejected by the Convention in Baton Rouge started an immediate clamor for another convention to be held in New Orleans for the purpose of placing in the field a ticket in opposition to the one nominated at the recent convention in Baton Rouge. When sufficient time had elapsed to permit the election of delegates, the convention assembled in Odd Fellows' Hall on August 25. When the roll was called, it was evident that a majority of the delegates were from the city of New Orleans, there being only four other parishes represented by a total of six delegates.<sup>29</sup> After the usual preliminaries had been disposed of, the convention proceeded to the nomination of a candidate for the office of Governor, and Thomas J. Wells of Rapides was accorded this honor by acclamation.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> *New Orleans Daily Delta*, September 14, 1859.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*



*The Campaign and Election of 1859*

Thus it was that two men who were residents of the same parish and neighbors were to be candidates for the same office. However, if either Moore or Wells made a campaign speech or in any other manner attempted to influence the electorate, there is no record of it. Both seemed content to let their respective political organizations assume the responsibility for waging the campaign. Moore spent one month during the summer in North Carolina on a vacation.<sup>31</sup> The newspapers during the campaign were especially active in espousing the cause of the nominee of their choice. Moore was accused of being a tool of Slidell, and it was charged that Slidell was giving his support to Moore with the expectation of being elected to the United States Senate at the next session of the Legislature.<sup>32</sup> It was further asserted that "Moore, who wore the mantle of the Overton dynasty," would sacrifice much in honor and dignity to be elected to the high office of Governor. In a more favorable attitude towards Moore's candidacy it was predicted that if elected he would save the party, and that

... he will go into the Gubernatorial Chair with a character for inflexible honesty and firmness equal to that of any man in the Union. He will go in without entangling alliances, personal or political. He will go in untrammelled by favoritism or associations. His appointments will be based on sound judgment and a disposition to elevate the party. Baton Rouge will no longer be the focus to which all the butterfly and humming bird politicians of New Orleans will flock. An iron will and a strong mind will destroy the power of those political chameleons who by pandering to the vanity of a yielding Executive have for years shaped the policy of the State Government. Col. Moore's ample means would place him above the necessity of having to bend to the wishes of a political dictator.<sup>33</sup>

Other supporters of Moore predicted that he would receive every independent vote in the city of New Orleans, and that he would carry the state by the greatest majority of any candidate who had ever made the race for Governor.<sup>34</sup>

The political career of Wells was closely scanned; those supporting him were able to find many fine qualifications which would serve him well in the position to which he aspired. His

<sup>31</sup> Baton Rouge *Weekly Advocate*, June 26, 1859.

<sup>32</sup> *Alexandria American*, October 22, 1859.

<sup>33</sup> "Letter to the Editor," *Alexandria Louisiana Democrat*, October 12, 1859.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, October 19, 1859.

opponents, however, charged that he, while a member of the Legislature in 1841, (1) had voted against a bill which provided for the calling of a constitutional convention to eliminate the many undemocratic features of the Constitution of 1812; (2) had voted against a bill providing for universal manhood suffrage; (3) had voted against a bill favoring the election of judges for a limited number of years, instead of being appointed for life; and (4) had voted against a bill which, if passed, would have allowed the voters of any parish to elect their parish officials.<sup>35</sup> It was further asserted that the principal motive which Wells had in seeking the office was to prevent Moore from being the only Louisiana Governor ever elected to office by a unanimous vote.

The state election was held on November 7, 1859. The total number of votes cast was rather large. The number of qualified voters in Louisiana for the year 1859 was 58,546, and of this number 17,232 were in the city of New Orleans.<sup>36</sup> When the votes were tabulated, the results showed that Thomas Overton Moore was victorious, with 25,474 votes to 15,587 for Wells.<sup>37</sup> The winning candidate carried every parish in the state except two, Orleans and Terrebonne.<sup>38</sup> In Rapides, the home parish of both men, the vote was 892 for Moore and 612 for Wells.<sup>39</sup>

#### *Moore's First Ten Months as Governor*

On January 23, 1860, Thomas Overton Moore was inaugurated as Governor of Louisiana. The ceremony was witnessed by a large throng which had gathered from all parts of the state for the occasion. The parade, headed by the State Militia, assembled at Third Street and proceeded to the capitol where the House Committee on Arrangements was waiting. From there the paraders marched to the temporary residence of the Governor-Elect who joined the parade, and thence again to the capitol. Governor Robert C. Wickliffe delivered a brief address in which he relinquished the position held by him for four years. He then administered the oath of office to his successor.<sup>40</sup> The *Daily*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, October 5, 1859.

<sup>36</sup> *Baton Rouge Weekly Advocate*, March 20, 1859.

<sup>37</sup> *Alexandria Louisiana Democrat*, January 25, 1860.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> *New Orleans Daily True Delta*, November 16, 1859.

<sup>40</sup> *Baton Rouge Daily Gazette and Comet*, January 24, 1860.

*Gazette and Comet*, commenting on the new Governor, had this to say:

We are favorably impressed with Governor Moore's personal appearance, much of the man is to be found in his direction. . . . We take him to be a gentleman of firmness and decision of character, and shall be very much deceived if the measure of our standard falls short.<sup>41</sup>

In his inaugural address which followed, Moore stated that he had not sought the office and that it was with reluctance that he had consented to allow his name to head the ticket. He felt, inasmuch as he was elected without the assistance of one political faction, that he would be held accountable for the conduct of his office only to the loyal citizens who elected him. He furthermore promised that in the exercise of the appointing power vested in the Governor for filling certain positions, he would be guided by but one consideration—ability to perform the duties thereof. Governor Moore, in speaking of people who supported a political party with the expectation of personal gain, said: "The support of a party for a reward is a degradation—not a merit—for the principles of a party can only be valuable where they contribute to the general good." He promised there would be strict economy in governmental functions during his term of office. He thought extravagance in government could usually be found in details of administration rather than in paying public officials large salaries.

The remainder of the message concerned itself with the grave dangers facing Louisiana, as well as the other slaveholding states. The rapid growth of the Republican party and its attitude toward the institution of slavery was a matter which concerned every state where there were slaves. On this issue the Governor said:

I cannot contemplate without the most serious alarm the condition to which the Southern States will be reduced, if a political party, organized in only one section of the country, and without followers or sympathizers in the other, should obtain possession of the government. . . .

Louisiana does not wish to see these States severed from their present political connections. But no man who has watched the course of the public mind can fail to observe in Louisiana, as well as in the other Southern States, the progress of disunion feeling, which has been marked

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*



and rapid. I am sure, however, that Louisiana dearly as she loves the Union will never separate herself from her sister slaveholding States. . . .<sup>42</sup>

In conclusion the new Governor stated that he thought it wise to reorganize the State Militia so as to be prepared to meet any emergency which might arise.<sup>43</sup>

The first session of the Legislature under Governor Moore accomplished very little in the way of constructive legislation. Many times during the session of sixty days, there were too few legislators present to constitute a quorum, because many of them were in New Orleans attending to personal business or were there on a pleasure trip.<sup>44</sup> The question of removing the capitol to New Orleans was made an issue in this session. The members who were in favor of the proposal argued that with such good means of transportation as then existed there was no need of the seat of government remaining in Baton Rouge. Assurances were given by the delegation from New Orleans that the city would furnish all necessary accommodations to the Legislature without any cost to the taxpayers of the state. However, on March 2, 1860, the measure was tabled in the Senate by a vote of 17 yeas to 9 nays. A few days later a bill was introduced which would provide \$30,000 to build an executive mansion.<sup>45</sup>

A bill was introduced and enacted into law during this session changing the name of the State Seminary of Learning to the "Louisiana State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy." This law provided that military tactics should constitute a part of the course of study taught in the institution. An appropriation of \$28,000 was made for the maintenance of the school during the year 1860. As a further means of placing the state in a position to defend herself, this act further provided that an arsenal should be maintained at the State Seminary of Learning and Military Academy.<sup>46</sup>

Another measure, more pacific in its purpose, was passed at this session. This act incorporated the Louisiana Historical Society for the purpose of collecting and preserving facts relating to the "natural, aboriginal, and civil history of the State." The Society was authorized to establish a chapter in any parish in the state, and its headquarters were to be in Baton Rouge.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Opelousas Courier, February 4, 1860.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> New Orleans Weekly Delta, January 21, 1860.

<sup>45</sup> Baton Rouge Gazette and Comet, March 6, 1860.

<sup>46</sup> Louisiana Acts (1860), Act 98, p. 67.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 6, p. 8.

The principal topic of discussion in Louisiana during the critical year of 1860 was the increasing agitation over the slavery question and the approaching Presidential election of November. Governor Moore felt that he should not, as Chief Executive of the state, commit himself as to whom he would support for the Presidency. However, as a private citizen, he expressed the opinion that if Abraham Lincoln, the candidate of the Republican party, should be elected, it would constitute just and legal cause for the Southern States to withdraw from the Union.<sup>48</sup> When the results of the Presidential election were known, Governor Moore was to put into action the words which he as a private citizen had on a previous occasion uttered.

### CHAPTER III

#### GOVERNOR MOORE AND THE SECESSION CONVENTION OF 1861

Moore convenes the Legislature in special session—his recommendations to the General Assembly—call for a Constitutional Convention to meet on January 23, 1861—the Governor confiscates Federal property in Louisiana—the Constitutional Convention convenes—Ordinance of Secession prepared—Rozier's proposed substitute—Fuqua's proposed substitute—Taliaferro protests against secession—the Secession Ordinance passed.

Within a fortnight after the results of the Presidential election were known, Governor Moore received many requests from prominent citizens of the state to convene the General Assembly in special session "to take into consideration pressing needs of the State as concerned its position in the Union."<sup>1</sup> A group of prominent merchants and capitalists of New Orleans addressed a letter to him asking what action he thought Louisiana should take in regard to the election of Lincoln. The answer given by the Governor to this letter was not pleasing to men of his own party, and much less so to those who were his political enemies. He recommended a conference of all the slaveholding states, and he thought it should be the aim of this meeting to preserve the states intact within the Union.<sup>2</sup> However, as time passed the Governor realized that the more influential Louisiana citizens were in sympathy with the other slave states, and that the general opinion prevailed as to the wisdom of immediate action by the leaders of the state.

<sup>48</sup> *Baton Rouge Daily Gazette and Comet*, October 19, 1860.

<sup>1</sup> *Baton Rouge Daily Gazette and Comet*, November 21, 1860.

<sup>2</sup> Greer, "Louisiana Politics, 1845-1861," *loc. cit.*, XIII, 478.

A petition signed by several hundred citizens urged the Governor to "convene the Legislature of our State at as early a day as practicable to take such measures as they deem necessary and proper to vindicate and secure our rights."<sup>3</sup> The petitioners were of the opinion that the election of Lincoln was evidence of a deep-seated hostility on the part of the North towards the people of Louisiana, and indeed towards all the Southern States. In view of this fact, and because other states of the South had convened their Legislatures in extraordinary session, it was the opinion of the signers of the petition that the Louisiana Legislature should also be assembled. Yielding to popular opinion, Governor Moore issued a call for a special session of the Legislature to convene in Baton Rouge on December 10, 1860.<sup>4</sup>

The proclamation, in setting forth the reasons for the call, employed practically the same reasons as those stated in the petitions received by the Governor after the Presidential election of November. It stated, in part:

... the election of Abraham Lincoln to the office of President of the United States by a sectional and aggressive anti-slavery party whose hostility to the people and institutions of the South has been evinced by repeated and long-continued violations of Constitutional obligations and fraternal amity, now consummated by this last insult and outrage perpetrated at and through the ballot does, in my opinion, as well that of a large number of citizens of all parties and pursuits, furnish an occasion, such as that contemplated by the Constitution. . . .<sup>5</sup>

This action of the Governor created a great deal of comment because the General Assembly was due to meet in regular session within a short time after the date set for the special session.<sup>6</sup> One newspaper had this to say of the Governor's proclamation:

We hope that no extreme measures will be taken at present. Let us stand by our right as guaranteed by the Constitution . . . till the last ray of hope expires and when this is past—when the North and South cannot live together . . . then there will be time to talk about a dissolution of the Union.<sup>7</sup>

Another paper not so friendly to the Governor made the charge that the special session was called for the purpose of appropriating

<sup>3</sup> *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, November 20, 1860.

<sup>4</sup> *Baton Rouge Daily Gazette and Comet*, November 24, 1860.

<sup>5</sup> *Alexandria Constitutional*, December 1, 1860.

<sup>6</sup> Lane C. Kendall, "The Interregnum in Louisiana in 1861," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XVI (1933), 180.

<sup>7</sup> *Alexandria Constitutional*, December 1, 1860.



two million dollars of the taxpayers' money "for the support of the diplomatic corps of the kingdom of Louisiana at the courts of Florida, Carolina, and Arkansas."<sup>8</sup>

When the Legislature had convened, Governor Moore appeared before them to deliver his message with its recommendations. It was evident that the Governor was well aware of the seriousness of the occasion. He began his message by stating the reasons for convening the General Assembly at that time—the election of Lincoln to the office of President, and the attitude of the Republican party toward the institution of slavery. Governor Moore further stated that it was his opinion and sincere conviction that Louisiana could not longer remain in the Union with honor to her people and her institutions. He thought that Louisiana should confer with all the other Southern States as to a probable course of concerted action. He also stated that it was his belief that the militia of the state should be reorganized and a Board of Military Affairs created. He thought this agency should be granted \$500,000 for the purchase of modern arms and munitions of war. He recommended to the Legislature the wisdom of providing for a Constitutional Convention to meet at a later date, for the purpose of determining the ultimate course of action that Louisiana should take in regard to severing relations with the United States.<sup>9</sup>

The General Assembly at this special session acted favorably upon the major recommendations embodied in the Governor's message. On December 10, 1860, the first day of the special session, Richard (Dick) Taylor introduced a bill calling for a Constitutional Convention.<sup>10</sup> A measure was also introduced providing for a reorganization of the state militia, by creating a Military Board composed of four members appointed by the Governor. It would be the duty of this Board to purchase such arms and munitions and other war materials as might be needed by the military force to repel any invasion of the state by an enemy. A provision of the military bill designated the places where the arms were to be stored, at New Orleans, the State Seminary of Learning, and such other points in the state as the Board might deem wise and expedient. The bill stipulated that an appropriation of \$500,000 should be made for carrying out the provisions of this act.<sup>11</sup> These bills were passed through both Houses with-

<sup>8</sup> *New Orleans Daily Delta*, November 22, 1860.

<sup>9</sup> *Alexandria Constitutional*, December 15, 1860.

<sup>10</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1860-61), Act 5, p. 6.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 1, p. 1.

out loss of time and with very little debate. The act providing for the Constitutional Convention specified that the delegates were to be elected on January 7, 1861, the number of such delegates to be equal to the number of senators and representatives in the Legislature from the several parishes. The Convention was to convene in Baton Rouge on January 23, 1861.<sup>12</sup>

Prior to adjournment the Legislature passed a joint resolution on the right of secession, which stated, in part:

... That any attempt to coerce or force a sovereign State to remain within the Union, come from whatever quarter and under whatever pretense it may, will be viewed by the people of Louisiana . . . as a hostile invasion and resisted to the utmost.<sup>13</sup>

Governor Moore, anticipating what the ultimate verdict of the Convention would be, made preparations to the end that the deliberations of that body would not be subjected to intimidation from the government at Washington. Moore was advised by Senator Judah P. Benjamin that secret attempts were being made by the federal government to garrison all forts. He also advised Governor Moore that there was a special reason for Louisiana to fear an attack from the naval forces which were stationed in the Gulf of Mexico.<sup>14</sup> After receiving this news, Moore sent the following message to the commander of the United States Arsenal at Baton Rouge: "The safety of the State of Louisiana demands that I take possession of all government property within her limits." The commanding officer was ordered to surrender the arsenal, barracks, and other public property to the military forces of the state.<sup>15</sup> On the same day the state militia was given orders to demand the surrender of Forts Jackson and St. Philip which were located on the Mississippi River below the city of New Orleans. Major Paul E. Theard, commander of the state forces, was instructed to haul down the United States flag and in its place to hoist the Pelican flag, and to defend the forts against any and all attacks.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 6, p. 8.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 10, p. 11.

<sup>14</sup> *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. (Washington, 1880-1901), Series 1, Vol. I, p. 496. Hereafter cited as *Official Records*.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. I, p. 489.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 491.

In defending his actions in seizing federal property, the Governor said:

... I had, therefore, determined that the State of Louisiana should not be left unprepared for the emergency. She had a long and exposed frontier on which the Federal government possessed fortresses capable of being used for the subjugation of the country and to annul the declared will of the people.<sup>17</sup>

However justified Governor Moore may have felt in confiscating this federal property, prior to the secession of Louisiana from the Union, he was severely criticized by one newspaper. One editor accused him of wanting to be a second Napoleon, whose ambition was to be the ruler of the universe.<sup>18</sup>

Although condemned by some for what he had done in seizing federal military property, Governor Moore probably felt that he was vindicated when the Constitutional Convention later gave him a unanimous vote of thanks for having performed these timely acts.<sup>19</sup>

#### *The Secession Convention*

In the election of delegates to the Convention two types of candidates sought the support of the electorate. One group, known as Cooperationists, adhered to the policy of cooperation with the other slaveholding states in finding a solution to the question other than outright secession. The other group, called Secessionists, favored immediate withdrawal from the Union. The returns of the election showed a decided majority of delegates who favored secession. For each Cooperationist elected there were two Secessionists.<sup>20</sup> Thus the determination of Louisiana to secede from the Union was unofficially declared by the result of the election of delegates to the Convention. However, the size of the popular vote—17,296 for the Cooperationists and 20,448 for the Secessionists—indicates that the voice of the people of Louisiana was not too strong for a separation from the Union.<sup>21</sup>

The convention met on January 23, 1861, and proceeded to the election of its officers. As presiding officer the Convention chose Ex-Governor Alexandre Mouton, a sugar planter from La-

<sup>17</sup> Charles Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, 4 vols. (F. F. Hansell & Bro., Ltd., New Orleans, 1903), IV, 90.

<sup>18</sup> *Alexandria Constitutional*, January 19, 1861.

<sup>19</sup> *Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1861* (J. O. Nixon, New Orleans, 1861), 14.

<sup>20</sup> *New Orleans Weekly Delta*, January 18, 1861.

<sup>21</sup> Greer, "Louisiana Politics, 1845-1861," *loc. cit.*, XIII, 633.



fayette Parish, who had also previously served his state in the United States Senate. After the organization of the Convention had been completed, a committee was appointed to notify the Governor that the Convention was ready to receive any message which he might care to submit to them. Governor Moore's message was for the most part a duplicate of the one which he had delivered to the Legislature only a short time previously.

He said that the people by their vote for delegates to the Convention had sustained the action of the Governor and the General Assembly in calling a convention of delegates who were for immediate and effective resistance. It was his opinion that there was no difference of sentiment regarding the right of secession from a hostile group of states determined to destroy the institution of slavery. It could not be doubted that the United States intended to employ force to keep the Southern States in the Union, and as proof of this intention he cited the attempt of the government at Washington to reinforce Fort Sumter in Charleston harbor. Warned by these acts and by the generally hostile utterances in Congress against the southern states, the Governor stated that he thought it wise to prepare the state for any show of force which might come. For this reason he had ordered all forts, ammunition depots, and other military fortifications within the borders of Louisiana to be surrendered to the state military authorities. He thought that by doing this the members of the Convention would be made to feel more free to carry out the wishes of those who had elected them.<sup>22</sup>

The Governor also stated that at the request of the Mississippi authorities he had loaned arms and ammunition to that state, which were necessary to repel an expected invasion by an army of the United States. He also expressed the thanks of the state to the banks and private citizens of Louisiana for their generous offers of financial assistance in this emergency. In conclusion, Governor Moore said:

"The future of our Louisiana rests in the counsels which shall be adopted by her freely chosen representatives, and we have reason to trust that they will decide calmly, wisely, and well."<sup>23</sup>

Although there was in his message to the Convention no recommendation as to immediate secession, there can be little

<sup>22</sup> *Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1861*, 13.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

doubt that Governor Moore well knew what the verdict of that Body would be on the matter. When the Governor's message had been completed, Chairman Mouton appointed a committee of fifteen to draw up an ordinance relative to secession. When the proposed Ordinance of Secession was presented to the Convention by John Perkins, Jr., of Madison Parish, a fiery debate ensued over the adoption of the ordinance, with some of the ablest speakers of the state opposing the measure.<sup>24</sup> The most brilliant speech against secession was delivered by James G. Taliaferro, delegate from Catahoula Parish. Mr. Taliaferro stated that he was opposed to the Ordinance of Secession for the following reasons:

1. The Acts of Aggression against the State could be remedied under the United States Constitution.
2. If the State did secede it would not remedy matters.
3. There was a possibility that the seceded States would not confederate or that the border slave States would secede.
4. Secession was a right not contemplated by the Constitution of the United States.
5. The proper status of Louisiana was with the border States.
6. By secession the State of Louisiana lost any claim it had to the public domain and to all property belonging to the Union.
7. Because secession would produce hardships, suffering, and destruction of property.
8. The Ordinance of Secession was drawn up by a convention which did not possess the legal right to sever relations with the Union.<sup>25</sup>

On January 24, J. Ad. Rozier of Orleans Parish introduced a substitute for the proposed Ordinance of Secession. This measure proposed that a convention of all the slaveholding states should convene in Nashville, Tennessee, on February 25, 1861; to propose such amendments to the Constitution of the United States as might be necessary to secure the rights of the slaveholding states. In the event that such proposed amendments were not incorporated in the Constitution of the United States, the

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>25</sup> *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. VIII, pp. 614-615.

Convention was to reassemble and organize a confederacy of the slave states. However, this proposed ordinance was defeated by a vote of 106 to 24.<sup>26</sup> Another substitute resolution was offered by James O. Fuqua, representing the parishes of East Baton Rouge, West Baton Rouge, and East Feliciana. This resolution declared that Louisiana would not remain in the Union with Lincoln as President, and that any attempt to coerce a state which had seceded would be regarded by Louisiana as an act of war and would absolve the state from all allegiance to the United States. The resolution also provided that Louisiana should elect six delegates to attend a convention of all the slaveholding states on February 4, 1861. Although this proposal received stronger support than the one submitted by Mr. Rozier, it was defeated by a vote of 73 to 47.<sup>27</sup>

In spite of the opposition encountered by the Secession Ordinance, the Convention adopted it by a vote of 113 to 17.<sup>28</sup> A motion was then made providing for submission of the Ordinance of Secession to the voters for ratification before it should become effective; however, this motion was defeated by a vote of 84 to 43.<sup>29</sup> When the vote on the Ordinance of Secession was announced, President Mouton arose and said: "In virtue of the vote just announced, I now declare the connection between the State of Louisiana and the Federal Union dissolved, and that she is a free, sovereign, and independent power."<sup>30</sup> Thus had been consummated the act which was to plunge Louisiana into four years of bitter and devastating war. Not even the wisest and most farsighted could know the price that the state was to pay for the act perpetrated by 113 men on that fateful day, January 26, 1861.

After her secession from the Union, Louisiana was destined to be an independent republic for a period of almost two months. During this interval of time, until Louisiana adopted the Confederate Constitution on March 21, 1861, matters of vital importance engaged the attention of the members of the Constitutional Convention.

After having adopted the Ordinance of Secession on January 26, the Convention adjourned in Baton Rouge, to reconvene

<sup>26</sup> *Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1861*, 10-11.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-12.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 19.



in New Orleans on January 29. However, previous to adjournment the Convention passed some other ordinances providing for (1) according free navigation of the Mississippi River to all friendly states and foreign powers, and (2) sending certified copies of the Ordinance of Secession to the Louisiana Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States and to the Governors of all the other Southern States.<sup>31</sup>

When the Convention had reconvened in New Orleans, John Perkins, Jr., of Madison Parish, a member of the Committee on Confederation, reported an ordinance providing for the election of six delegates to the convention of all the seceding states, which was to meet in Montgomery, Alabama, on February 4. This resolution was adopted and the following six delegates were elected by the Convention: John Perkins, Jr., and Alexander Declouet, delegates at large; Charles M. Conrad, Duncan F. Kenner, Edward Sparrow, and Henry Marshall, delegates to represent the state's four Congressional districts.<sup>32</sup>

On the same day the Convention adopted an ordinance which provided (1) that all Federal officers in the civil service of the United States and all Federal laws relating to such employees should be continued in force as officers and laws of the state, except the officers of the judiciary, postal and land departments of the late United States; (2) that the navigation and revenue laws of the United States should continue as Louisiana laws, except that duties on imports from the states of the Federal Union were not to be collected; (3) that all Federal employees in the Parish of Orleans must recognize the power and authority of Louisiana, that these employees must take an oath to the sovereign state of Louisiana, and those who refused to comply with this provision automatically vacated the position held; and (4) that the State of Louisiana guaranteed to every Federal officer, who complied with the Ordinance of the Convention, all claims and demands of the Federal Union arising out of such compliance.<sup>33</sup>

The President of the Convention appointed a committee of five to take an inventory of the public property in the hands of the officers of the "late Federal Union within the Parish of Orleans on February 1, 1861." This committee reported that ap-

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-24.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 235-237.

proximately half a million dollars in gold and silver was in the mint. This sum was in the custody of A. J. Guirot, Collector of Customs, whom the Convention requested should be placed under bond of \$100,000 for the faithful performance of his official duties.<sup>34</sup>

Another ordinance adopted on February 5 provided for a "regular military force for the protection of the State, to consist of one regiment of artillery and one regiment of infantry and such general and staff officers" as might be needed.<sup>35</sup>

On February 7 the Convention adopted an ordinance relative to citizenship. It declared that all white persons who were citizens of Louisiana on January 26, 1861, were citizens of Louisiana. All those who were citizens of any of the other states and had resided in Louisiana for one year prior to secession, would upon taking the oath of allegiance become citizens.<sup>36</sup>

On February 4 a committee of three was appointed to design a flag for the republic of Louisiana; and on February 11 J. K. Elgee of Rapides Parish, chairman of this committee, reported that a flag ordinance was ready to be presented to the Convention.<sup>37</sup>

The Convention next concerned itself with the organization of the judicial department of the state. The laws of the United States relating to the organization and jurisdiction of circuit and district courts were to continue in force, except that suits should be brought in the name of the State of Louisiana.<sup>38</sup>

The Convention recessed from February 12 to March 4, 1861. On March 7 a resolution was adopted which declared that all the unappropriated public domain within the state became the property of Louisiana. However, all laws and regulations respecting the survey of such lands were to remain in force unless inconsistent with the ordinances passed by the Convention.<sup>39</sup>

The Constitution of the Confederate States of America was submitted to the Convention on March 19, 1861, and was taken up for consideration two days later. Several attempts were

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 34.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 249-251.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, 47-48.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 251-255.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 263-265.

made to have the Constitution of the Confederacy submitted directly to the people for ratification. Fenelon Cannon of Avoyelles Parish submitted an ordinance which provided that the Confederate Constitution should be printed in French and English thirty days prior to an election to decide upon its acceptance or rejection. In case the Confederate Constitution was rejected by the electorate, the President of the Convention was "to call together this Convention, at as early date as possible with a view of determining upon the best course of action for the future welfare of the State." However, this proposal was defeated by a vote of 74 to 26.<sup>40</sup>

J. Ad. Rozier, delegate from Orleans Parish, favored the election of delegates to another convention to accept or reject the Confederate Constitution. He again condemned the Ordinance of Secession and claimed that the "present Convention" was not the legal body to pass upon the Confederate Constitution. His proposal was tabled by a vote of 94 to 10.<sup>41</sup> All opposition to the acceptance of the Confederate Constitution came to naught and the instrument was ratified by the Convention on March 21, 1861, by a vote of 101 to 7.<sup>42</sup>

After ratification of the Confederate Constitution, an ordinance was introduced which provided "that the State of Louisiana doth hereby cede unto the Confederate States of America the right to use, possess, and occupy all the forts, arsenals, lighthouses, the mint, customhouse, and other public buildings acquired by the State from the late United States." This measure also ceded to the government at Montgomery, Alabama, the revenue cutters acquired from the United States.<sup>43</sup> An ordinance was also passed changing the time of the meeting of the next regular session of the Legislature to the fourth Monday in November, 1861.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 75.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 75-76.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.



## CHAPTER IV

## FROM SECESSION TO FEDERAL OCCUPATION OF NEW ORLEANS

(January 26, 1861-April 26, 1862)

Seizure of remaining United States property in Louisiana—preparation for war by Louisiana—Moore asks the Confederacy to prepare the defenses of the state—provision for soldiers' clothing—compulsory attendance at military drill—Legislature meets, November, 1861—Governor's message—legislation enacted—veto of Cotton Bill—preparations of New Orleans for Federal attack—surrender of New Orleans, April, 1862.

Louisiana, having cast her lot with the other seceding states, lost no time in making adequate preparation to maintain by force what she had secured for herself in the recent Convention. Two days after the state had seceded Governor Moore caused to be seized all supplies in the Quartermaster's commissary in New Orleans.<sup>1</sup> At the same time all medical supplies within the boundaries of the state which belonged to the Federal government were confiscated by the state authorities.<sup>2</sup> On February 3 Fort Macomb was ordered surrendered and the Federal forces were given notice to make plans to evacuate the premises.<sup>3</sup> At the same time the Customhouse in New Orleans together with the Sub-Treasury and the United States Mint were ordered to be surrendered.<sup>4</sup> In compliance with an ordinance adopted by the Constitutional Convention on March 25, Governor Moore turned over to the Confederate government all the supplies and property of the United States within Louisiana which had been taken possession of by state forces.<sup>5</sup> He also transferred to the Confederacy a sum of over a half million dollars which had been taken from the United States Mint and Sub-Treasury in New Orleans, as he had been instructed to do under the provisions of an ordinance adopted by the Convention on March 7, 1861.<sup>6</sup>

The people of Louisiana, led by their Governor, made rapid progress in contributing the state's share of men and materials necessary to carry on the war. From the beginning of hostilities there was a shortage of guns and other munitions of war in the South. Writing to the Confederate Secretary of War on March

<sup>1</sup> *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. LIII, p. 493.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 497.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 492.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 498.

<sup>5</sup> *Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1861*, p. 88.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

13, 1861, Governor Moore told him that all the guns, munitions, and other property which he had caused to be seized from the United States had been sent to the Confederacy, and that the forts and other fortifications within the state were poorly armed and in no condition to defend Louisiana should an invasion attempt be made. He expressed his hope that this deplorable situation would soon be taken care of by the general government.<sup>7</sup> When sufficient time had elapsed and this matter had not been attended to by the Confederate government, Governor Moore issued an order that no more arms and munitions be sent from the state.<sup>8</sup> In the latter part of March, he wrote to the Confederate Secretary of War that an attack on New Orleans was being planned and the city was wholly without any means of repelling such an attack. In his reply to this appeal, Secretary of War Walker said the attack was to be made on Pensacola, Florida, and that all available troops were to be sent to that point at once.<sup>9</sup>

Despite the pleas Governor Moore made to the Confederate authorities for an adequate defense of his state, nothing of any consequence was done in the matter until it was too late. However, this failure to properly defend her territory from invasion did not lessen the material aid which Louisiana sent to the Confederacy.

On April 13, 1861, Governor Moore asked for 5,000 volunteers in addition to the 3,000 already called for at the request of the President of the Confederacy.<sup>10</sup> When a drive was inaugurated for the sale of Confederate bonds, the citizens of Louisiana quickly subscribed their quota.<sup>11</sup> By the end of June, 1861, Louisiana had raised and armed 16,000 men who were in the Confederate service outside the borders of the state.<sup>12</sup> Within another six months the total number of soldiers from Louisiana had increased to 60,726.<sup>13</sup> In speaking of Louisiana's loyalty to the cause of secession, one contemporary writer made the following comment:

Louisiana was then in as high state of prosperity as ever any land was blessed with, but with blind imprudence

<sup>7</sup> *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. LIII, p. 636.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, 667.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 676.

<sup>10</sup> Alcée Fortier, *A History of Louisiana*, 4 vols. (Manzi, Joyant & Co., New York, 1904), IV, 6.

<sup>11</sup> *Baton Rouge Gazette and Comet*, April 20, 1861.

<sup>12</sup> Jefferson Davis Bragg, *Louisiana in the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge, 1941), 59.

<sup>13</sup> Fortier, *op. cit.*, IV, 7.

she did not hesitate to stake the whole of it on the cast of a die, at what she conceived to be the call of honor and duty. . . .<sup>14</sup>

Governor Moore was anxious to see that the material needs of soldiers from Louisiana were amply supplied. He called upon the people of the state to send such blankets as were not absolutely necessary at home, so that these might be sent to the soldiers in the field. He also advised those people who were making clothes for the men in service to send the finished garments to his agent in New Orleans. In this way, he said, each soldier would be sure to get the correct supply of clothing.<sup>15</sup> In making this request, the Governor said:

I am now endeavoring to furnish the Volunteer Troops of Louisiana with suitable winter clothing. . . . I am now informed that the patriotic citizens of several parishes are also engaged in similar preparations. If these contributions of clothing are sent by them directly to their several companies without my being aware of the quantity and kind sent, great confusion and waste will be the consequence. . . . It is of great importance that each one of our soldiers shall have good substantial woolen suits, but it is also important that there be a concert of action among those supplying them, in order to avoid sending double supplies to companies.<sup>16</sup>

In September, 1861, the Governor recommended to the banks of the state that they suspend specie payments. This, he pointed out, was necessary in order for the Confederate treasury notes to circulate as sound currency. In making this recommendation, Governor Moore said: "I am well aware that they [the banks] incur the risk of a forfeiture of their charters, from which neither the Legislature nor the Chief Executive can relieve them." However, he stated that the Constitution could be amended at the next session of the Legislature so as to legalize the act, and that he would make this recommendation to that body.<sup>17</sup>

From every side economic problems beset the Governor in his efforts to aid in the prosecution of the war. During the early fall of 1861 the cotton merchants of New Orleans appealed to him to ban the shipment of cotton to that city. This action, the petitioners said, was necessary because cotton was being carried through the blockade and sold to the enemy. When sufficient

<sup>14</sup> Gayarré, *op. cit.*, IV, 693.

<sup>15</sup> *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, September 13, 1861.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, September 16, 1861.



proof of this fact had been submitted, the Governor issued an order that no more cotton was to be sent to New Orleans until the blockade had been lifted.<sup>18</sup>

There were other evidences of disloyalty to the South during the first year of the war, especially in New Orleans and the parishes adjacent thereto. The Governor gave orders that a search be made in each parish to find the traitors, and when apprehended their homes were to be burned.<sup>19</sup> One report to the Secretary of War stated that there were many spies in New Orleans who were keeping the enemy informed of all the military activities within the state.<sup>20</sup>

With the coming of 1862, Governor Moore realized that if Louisiana was to be adequately prepared to defend herself this preparation must be made by the citizens of the state under his leadership. When the people of New Orleans subscribed \$100,000 for defense of their city, the Governor assured them that an equal amount would be made available by the state for the same purpose.<sup>21</sup> In September of the previous year, President Jefferson Davis had sent Major General Mansfield Lovell to supervise the preparations for the defense of New Orleans and to adopt such other military measures as he might deem necessary to protect the state against threatened invasion.<sup>22</sup> However, President Davis told Governor Moore that he did not think the enemy would attack New Orleans, and if such an attack did come he was confident that the efforts of the foe would not succeed.<sup>23</sup>

Military matters engaged a great deal of the Governor's attention during these critical months. Because of an indifference to attending military drill, he asked the business houses in the towns and cities to close at two o'clock in the afternoon on drill days in order that those subject to drill might have an opportunity to take part therein.<sup>24</sup> As a further measure to stimulate attendance at military drill, orders were issued that the commanders of divisions should take a census of all males between the ages of 18 and 45 years, and if any were found eligible and were not taking part in the prescribed military drill these people

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, October 5, 1861.

<sup>19</sup> *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. LII, p. 724.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 713.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 726.

<sup>22</sup> Dunbar Rowland (editor), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist: His Letters, Papers, and Speeches*, 10 vols. (Jackson, Miss., 1923), IV, 136.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, October 2, 1861.

should be placed on a "Black List" and branded as enemies of the South.<sup>25</sup> The press of the state, in some sections, was very critical of this edict issued by the Governor. Said one editorial:

Governor Moore seems determined to render the Militia of the State as perfect as possible, if there be any virtue in drills. . . . The people of Louisiana have ever held military duty in contempt and ridicule. . . . The important point is to know what the privates are to use in drilling. Has the State any arms for that purpose or is every man expected to find a shooting iron of his own? Now how will this operate in the sugar section of the State when every planter and his assistants are busily engaged in making sugar? Time is doubly valuable to sugar planters now, and it is of the greatest importance to the State, if not the whole Confederacy that the sugar crop shall be made. . . . This is an item worth considering by the Governor.<sup>26</sup>

Other critics of the Governor pointed out that sugar and molasses need not be exported to find a sale. The armies would require a large part of the crop, and even though paid for in Confederate treasury notes the proceeds would go a long way in alleviating the financial problems of the state at that time. Others commented that the order was likely to produce a counter effect to that which was intended.<sup>27</sup>

In Louisiana, as in the other sections of the Confederacy, there was an acute shortage of guns. As a means of relieving this situation in Louisiana, Governor Moore ordered that an inventory be made in each parish of all firearms of whatever calibre and make, and the same be turned over to the military authorities in the parish. Those persons who refused to surrender their firearms were to be considered as traitors to the government.<sup>28</sup>

When the Legislature convened in November, 1861, Governor Moore appeared before that body to inform the lawmakers of his recommendations concerning needed legislation. The message indicated, throughout, how carefully the Governor had studied the needs of his state during the first eight months of the war. He was of the opinion that the most pressing problem which faced the General Assembly was the financial condition of the state. A study of the Treasurer's Report revealed that only one-third of the taxes due the state had been paid. Due at

<sup>25</sup> *Baton Rouge Gazette and Comet*, October 2, 1861.

<sup>26</sup> *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, October 5, 1861.

<sup>27</sup> *Baton Rouge Gazette and Comet*, October 2, 1861.

<sup>28</sup> *Alexandria Louisiana Democrat*, August 7, 1861.

the time was an amount which equaled a million dollars, he said. This condition, the Governor explained, was due to the fact that the people had been unable to dispose of their crops, and he recommended that an extension of time be given those who were delinquent through no fault of their own.<sup>29</sup>

A part of the message suggested the wisdom of enacting suitable legislation whereby Confederate treasury notes might be used in payment of state taxes. Adequate provision must be made, said the Governor, for the securing of supplies for the farmers of the state. He recommended that the planters be permitted to give supply notes which would be negotiable and would express on their faces that they could be used only in the purchase of necessary supplies. The payment of these notes would be secured by imparting to them the quality of a lien on the crop. As a further financial aid to the farmers, the Governor said that the people in some sections of the state were of the opinion that the Confederate government should purchase a portion of the cotton crop. He did not deem this plan wise, and he thought if it became necessary for any governmental agency to adopt such a plan it should be the state. But he said: "In either case I fear the adoption of such a measure would prove disastrous."<sup>30</sup>

Governor Moore informed the Legislature that the Confederate government had been forced to issue paper money based upon its credit and upon direct taxation levied on the people of the several states. When this was done, the Governor said that he had recommended to the financial institutions of Louisiana that they suspend specie payment. In doing this, he stated that he was well aware of the fact that the banks ran the risk of forfeiting their charters because to do this was a violation of the Constitution. However, he recommended to the Legislature that it instruct the Attorney-General to refrain from prosecuting the banks until appropriate legislation might be enacted to cope with the situation. With the increasing scarcity of coin, he stated, many private and public institutions had begun to issue small paper notes which were circulating as currency, and that in addition to being a violation of the law such a practice would soon flood the country with fiat money. He asked the General Assembly to enact legislation which would permit the banks to issue notes of denominations less than five dollars.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> "Governor's Message," in *New Orleans Daily Delta*, November 29, 1861.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*



In the part of the message which concerned itself with military affairs, the Governor stated that he had not received the Adjutant-General's Report, but he would give as accurate a statement as possible from his memory. At this point, he said:

I have been almost exclusively engaged in the organization of our military force, and am, therefore, able with the aid of memoranda from the Adjutant-General's office, to give you a general idea of the number of troops furnished by this State to the Confederate Government.<sup>32</sup>

In April, 1861, he stated, the Confederate government made its first request for three thousand men. Again, in the following July, the Secretary of War had asked for five thousand troops, and later in the same month for an additional three thousand. In addition to these, he said, there had been fourteen companies of infantry mustered into the Confederate service for the special defense of Louisiana. These troops totaled 20,202, and were at that time in service in Florida, Missouri, Virginia, and Kentucky. He further stated there had been many companies raised in the state and tendered directly to the President of the Confederacy. As to the exact number of these troops it was not possible for him to make an accurate estimate. However, he thought the number of such troops would approximate about 3,891 men. If this estimate was correct, Governor Moore said that Louisiana at that time had in all branches of the service 24,093 troops.<sup>33</sup>

He then called attention to the effort made to furnish suitable clothing for the soldiers who were living in a colder climate than that to which they had been accustomed. Referring to this matter, the Governor said:

A large number of our troops are in Virginia and reports . . . reached me of their suffering from sickness and the increasing rigor of a colder climate than that to which they were accustomed. . . . I could not think of the noble and gallant soldiers who had left homes and families in a generous spirit of self-sacrifice, and had rushed to their country's call to the defense of her soil, marching without shoes or fighting our battles pinched with cold and shivering from exposure. . . .<sup>34</sup>

He went on to say that he was aware of the fact that no money had been provided for this purpose, and that he had

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

borrowed from the banks the amount necessary, trusting the Legislature would at a later time sustain him in that act. The amount borrowed for the purchase of soldiers' clothing was \$670,000. Governor Moore was lavish in his praise of the aid contributed by private citizens, and especially the women, in furnishing blankets and clothing for the soldiers. Concerning this matter, he said:

Fearing that I would not be able to procure a sufficient number of blankets by purchase, I invited all persons to send me such as they could spare from their homes. The response was immediate and the supply profuse. Families stripped their own beds in the humane and patriotic effort to make the soldiers comfortable; and voluntary associations of the wives, mothers, and daughters of the State were formed in every parish, which vied with each other in industry and skill, and in the effort to provide promptly for the soldiers. The people are ready for any effort and every sacrifice in this, the holiest of causes. . . .<sup>35</sup>

Governor Moore called the attention of the Legislature to the fact that appropriations must be made by them to provide payment of the loans contracted by him, and for the expense of operating the government for the ensuing year. Because of the inability of many people to pay their taxes, he thought it unwise to rely too much upon this source of revenue. Again referring to matters of finance, the Governor said that, in order to be prepared for an invasion of the state, he had ordered the Quartermaster to provide equipment for five thousand men for a period of thirty days, and the amount necessary for this emergency was \$100,000. This amount had also been borrowed from the banks. However, he told the Legislature that President Davis had assured him the Confederate government would pay a part of the expenses incurred for military purposes.<sup>36</sup>

A part of the message was concerned with the direct tax levied by the Confederate government on the people of the several states. On the basis of population, this tax in Louisiana would amount to \$2,000,000. A provision of the tax law provided that if the state would assume the responsibility of collecting the tax, ten per cent of the amount collected might be retained as expenses involved therein. Governor Moore suggested that the state should assume the responsibility of collecting the tax, and thereby save \$200,000.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*

Relative to the militia laws of Louisiana, the Governor said:

I recommend a careful revision of the whole militia law of the State, the repeal of all exemptions, the compulsory mustering of all males between the ages of eighteen and fifty, and affixing a penalty for nonperformance of duty other than a pecuniary fine. . . .<sup>38</sup>

Furthermore, he thought that if the war continued there should be created a special department which would handle all the military affairs of the state.

The latter part of his message was devoted to the advisability of the passage of a "Stay Law."<sup>39</sup> The Governor said he realized that some form of legislation should be enacted which would afford relief to the farmer, but he doubted the wisdom of providing this relief in the form of a stay law. Commenting upon this point, he said:

But great caution should be exercised in making such provision. A blow at public credit—any act by which doubt or suspicion could attach to the public honor and plighted faith of the State, not only in performing her own obligations, but in enforcing upon her citizens the performance of theirs, is in my judgment, the greatest calamity that could befall us. . . .<sup>40</sup>

If such a law were enacted, the Governor thought it should permit all suits to go regularly to judgment, so as to enable the plaintiff to have the benefit of the security it would afford. Then the proposed law should interpose and prohibit the issuing of an execution or an executory process, the effect of which would be a compulsory sale of the property involved. It was his opinion that especially the soldiers in service should be protected in their property while in active service.<sup>41</sup>

In concluding his message, the Governor admonished the legislators to confine themselves to making such laws as were absolutely needed to meet the existing emergencies, and to a provision for those unavoidable necessities of the immediate future which the military status required.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> A law which would prohibit the execution of certain civil laws pertaining to property, which had been mortgaged as security for financial obligations.

<sup>40</sup> *New Orleans Daily Delta*, November 29, 1861.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*



The message was well received by the press of the state. One editorial stated:

This document, which has been so anxiously looked for, was read to both branches of the General Assembly on Tuesday last. It is unquestionably one of the best tempered papers that ever issued from an Executive of the State. It will be perused with pride and admiration by every Louisianian. . . .<sup>42</sup>

Following very closely the recommendations of Governor Moore, the Legislature began its duties. A joint resolution was passed requesting the Confederate government to suspend all tariffs on imported goods. The resolution stated that the tariff should be suspended because (1) it was practically inoperative on account of the blockade, and (2) because of the exorbitant prices being paid for all imported goods.<sup>43</sup> A bill was introduced which provided for a stay law, prohibiting the sale of property within the state for debts for the duration of the war and for one year thereafter.<sup>44</sup> There was much opposition to this proposed measure.<sup>45</sup> Writing in opposition to the provisions of the proposed law, one newspaper stated:

. . . it is clearly and absolutely violative of the express provisions of the Constitution which every member of the Senate and House of Representatives has taken a solemn oath on the Holy Evangelists of Almighty God to obey and enforce.<sup>46</sup>

It was further maintained by some that England would soon be at war with the United States and the blockade would be broken as a result, thereby permitting all honest people to sell their crops and pay what they owed.<sup>47</sup> Probably because of such effective opposition, a compromise was reached which prohibited the sale for debt of the property of any individual who was engaged in the military service of the state or of the Confederate States.<sup>48</sup>

Relief was provided for the banks, which had suspended specie payment at the request of the Governor. This measure provided that no legal action could be taken against any bank for non-payment in specie during the war and for a period

<sup>42</sup> *West Baton Rouge Sugar Planter*, November 3, 1861.

<sup>43</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1861), No. 6, p. 6.

<sup>44</sup> *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, December 20, 1861.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, January 8, 1862.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, December 20, 1861.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1861), Act 16, p. 12.

of twelve months thereafter.<sup>49</sup> Another act was passed permitting the free banks of the state to issue circulating notes, the amount of which should never exceed three-fourths of their capital stock.<sup>50</sup> As a means of raising revenue, a law was enacted which gave the Governor power, at his discretion, to borrow in the name of the state a sum not to exceed seven million dollars. The loans made under this act were to be contracted by issuing bonds or treasury notes of the state.<sup>51</sup>

The General Assembly also passed a law which made Confederate treasury notes receivable in the payment of all debts or claims due the state.<sup>52</sup> A tax moratorium was provided by an act which postponed until January 1, 1863, the collection of all state taxes already due.<sup>53</sup> As a means of raising revenue for the defense of the state, the Legislature empowered the Governor to place on sale state bonds to the amount of one million dollars.<sup>54</sup> Another two and a half million dollars was appropriated for the payment of the Confederate War Tax.<sup>55</sup>

An Association for the relief of sick and wounded soldiers was established by act of the Legislature. Said Association was to be under the supervision of a group of prominent citizens of the state. The act further provided that hospitals might be set up in any state where Louisiana soldiers were stationed.<sup>56</sup> The sum of \$150,000 was appropriated to carry the provisions of this measure into effect;<sup>57</sup> and an additional \$150,000 was appropriated for the maintenance of hospitals within the state of Louisiana.<sup>58</sup>

The General Assembly also placed a bill intended to provide relief for the cotton planters. The chief feature of the proposed law was that the state should issue ten million dollars in treasury notes to circulate as currency, the notes to be loaned to the planters on a pledge of their cotton crop as security.<sup>59</sup> There was bitter criticism of this measure in many sections of the state. One newspaper said:

There was a powerful protest by the minority of the Committee which reported the bill. It took very clear and

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 69, p. 45.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 68, p. 44.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 116, p. 85.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 112, p. 82.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 108, p. 79.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 45, p. 29.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 29, p. 19.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 61, p. 38.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 58, p. 36.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 78, p. 51.

<sup>59</sup> *New Orleans Daily Delta*, December 27, 1861.

rational grounds, which we trust will yet prevail, against a plan which threatens to engulf all the property of Louisiana in a flood of depreciated paper money, and to plunge us into financial difficulties which a generation of prosperous times would be required to remove or materially lighten.<sup>60</sup>

In further comment upon the features of this Cotton Bill, the same newspaper had this to say:

We know the Chief Executive has the firmness to discharge his duties. . . . If he believes it wrong, we know his character too well to suppose that he will hesitate a moment. It will bring down a furious clamor, but they who will most malign him now will, in the future, thank him with grateful hearts for saving them from destruction.<sup>61</sup>

The Cotton Bill passed both Houses and was sent to the Governor for his signature. After due consideration of the features of the act, Governor Moore placed his veto upon it. In his veto message to the General Assembly he stated that he vetoed the bill for the following reasons: (1) The Constitution provided that the state should not subscribe for the stock of, nor make a loan to, nor pledge its faith for the benefit of any corporation or joint stock company established for banking purposes; (2) the Constitution provided that whenever the state contracted a debt which exceeded two million dollars, the Legislature should provide the means of paying the debt, and no such provision had been made in the Cotton Bill; and (3) the act was contrary to the Confederate Constitution which forbade a state to emit bills of credit, and should this measure become a law the State of Louisiana would be guilty of emitting bills of credit.<sup>62</sup> When the veto message had been read, the Legislature attempted to override the action taken by the Governor. However, the necessary two-thirds majority to override the veto could not be mustered, and the Governor's action was sustained.<sup>63</sup>

His veto of the Cotton Bill brought the Governor much praise. Ex-Governor Alexandre Mouton, in a letter to him, stated:

The news has just reached us, of your veto of the famous "Cotton Bill," and it has produced great rejoicing in this community. . . . Your services to our State under our great trials are duly appreciated by every right thinking man, but none will be more lasting than the one you have just performed.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>60</sup> *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, January 5, 1862.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>62</sup> *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, January 25, 1862.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, January 22, 1862.

<sup>64</sup> A. Mouton to T. O. Moore, January 25, 1862 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).



Another comment on the veto stated:

The Governor of this State deserves the lasting gratitude of the Commonwealth. . . . In acting as he has done, Governor Moore has signally justified the expectations of those who knew him best, and has rendered still clearer his title to their abiding confidence in the solidity of his judgment and the prudence and firmness of his policy.<sup>65</sup>

The Legislature having adjourned, Governor Moore was again active in promoting the welfare of the troops from Louisiana. In January, 1862, he again appealed to the people who were sending clothing and other personal needs to the soldiers to work in co-operation. He pointed out the wisdom of having a central depot where all supplies might be sent and in this way avoid duplicating orders to any one individual.<sup>66</sup>

As the blockade continued, the necessities of life became scarce and those that were available were selling at exorbitant prices. Salt was discovered in the southern part of Louisiana in 1862, and from these mines was produced from ten to thirty thousand tons of salt. However, a short time later these mines were captured by the enemy.<sup>67</sup> During these critical times the salt licks of northwest Louisiana were again utilized; and so bountiful was the supply of salt produced in the state that it was shipped as far east as Alabama and Georgia.<sup>68</sup>

On January 26, 1862, the State of Louisiana observed the first anniversary of her secession from the United States. A huge military parade was staged by the state militia in the city of New Orleans. Governor Moore reviewed the troops as they paraded down Canal Street to the delight of the cheering holiday crowd which had turned out to greet them. By a previously issued proclamation the Governor had requested the banks and other business houses to close for the occasion.<sup>69</sup> In the midst of this anniversary celebration, the mind of the Governor, as well as the thoughts of the people, must have been dwelling on more serious events to come. From the beginning of the war Louisiana had been sending men and materials of war from the state, and now that an attack upon her soil was imminent it seemed that very little assistance would be given her by the

<sup>65</sup> New Orleans *Daily Delta*, January 22, 1862.

<sup>66</sup> New Orleans *Daily Crescent*, January 20, 1862.

<sup>67</sup> Edward Bennet Matthews, "Mines and Mining," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, 13 vols. (Richmond, 1909-1913), V, 297.

<sup>68</sup> Ella Lonn, *Salt as a Factor in the Confederacy* (New York, 1933), 71.

<sup>69</sup> New Orleans *Daily Crescent*, January 27, 1862.

government at Richmond. In commenting upon this situation, one eminent Southern historian has said:

Until cut off from the Confederacy by the opening of the Mississippi, Louisiana sent more than its quota of troops to guard the upper frontier of the South.

During the first year of the war fever ran high. The parishes made appropriations for the pay and support of soldiers; the city of New Orleans spent all its available funds to aid in the mustering of the troops, and all over the state private individuals made generous contributions to aid the movement.

There was for a year little thought of invasion. True the coast was blockaded and the commerce of New Orleans was destroyed, but the eyes of most Louisianians were turned to the Virginia frontier. The troops raised in the state were rapidly sent out, and by November, 1861, 24,000 had gone, while nearly 30,000 more were being assembled and organized. . . .<sup>70</sup>

In the early months of 1862 the citizens of the state were becoming aware of federal plans being made for the capture of New Orleans. During February of this year, the City Council of New Orleans appointed a Committee of Public Safety whose duty it would be to assist the State and Confederate authorities in making preparations for the defense of the city. This committee, composed of prominent citizens, sent a memorial, accompanied by a letter from Governor Moore, to President Davis informing him of the deplorable condition of the Navy stationed at New Orleans. This document stated that (1) the naval force stationed at that city had been greatly reduced; (2) the outstanding indebtedness of the Navy was between six and eight hundred thousand dollars, the greater part of which was owed to the foundries for ammunition, and to the machine shops; (3) many labor bills were from six to eight months in arrears, and in many instances private citizens had contributed their funds so the work of defense might continue. In conclusion the memorial stated: "Your Excellency will doubtless agree with the Committee that this is a deplorable state of things."<sup>71</sup>

In his letter which accompanied the memorial of the Committee, Governor Moore stated:

Your Excellency will no doubt appreciate the necessity for immediate action to preserve not only the dignity and credit of the Navy Department, but also to provide such defenses as we are in absolute and immediate need of.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>70</sup> Walter Lynwood Fleming, "Louisiana, 1861-1867," in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, III, 135.

<sup>71</sup> *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. VI, pp. 830-831.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*

The commanding officer in charge of the defense of New Orleans, Major General Mansfield Lovell, also wrote President Davis concerning the conditions of defense in New Orleans and other parts of the state. He stated that Louisiana had sent over 20,000 men into the field well armed and equipped, and now that her day of trial was near at hand she was unable to provide the necessary arms and munitions of war for the volunteer force organized for the defense of the State against threatened invasion by the enemy.<sup>73</sup>

In an attempt to provide his soldiers with the most necessary fighting equipment, Governor Moore purchased twenty thousand rifles and thirty thousand rounds of ammunition. These materials of war were landed on the Florida coast where the governor of that state seized the entire shipment, keeping one half for his own use and sending the other half to the Confederate War Department at Richmond. Writing to President Davis, Governor Moore said:

This unpardonable and unparalleled outrage is nothing short of robbery and just as bad. . . . I have given all the arms I had, expecting that these would be in the hands of my own troops. Now that thirty-seven enemy sails are in the river, in God's name, in the name of my State, I ask you to order them sent to me immediately.<sup>74</sup>

About the middle of April, 1862, the Federal fleet began a siege of the forts on the Mississippi River below the city of New Orleans.<sup>75</sup> The poorly-equipped Confederate forces were able to offer little effective resistance to such a formidable force as now faced them. When it became evident that the city would be captured, the commanding general ordered the people to burn all cotton and tobacco to prevent it from falling into the hands of the enemy.<sup>76</sup> Prior to the fall of New Orleans, Governor Moore had all the coin of the New Orleans banks sent to Richmond for safe keeping.<sup>77</sup> Having evacuated all war materials which might be of use to the enemy, the troops under command of Major General Mansfield Lovell made a gallant but vain attempt to defend the city. However, with a superior fighting force, well equipped and manned, the Federal forces under com-

<sup>73</sup> General Lovell to President Davis, January 18, 1862, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. LIII, p. 774.

<sup>74</sup> Moore to President Davis, April 1, 1862, in *ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. VI, p. 869.

<sup>75</sup> Same to same, April 17, 1862, in *ibid.*, 878.

<sup>76</sup> Lovell to Randolph, Secretary of War, April 20, 1862, in *ibid.*, 883.

<sup>77</sup> Rowland, *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, V, 235.



mand of Admiral David G. Farragut demanded the surrender of the city on April 26, 1862.

The capture of the South's leading port city was a severe blow to Louisiana as well as to the entire Confederacy. It marked the beginning of the subjugation of Louisiana by the Federal forces which was not to end until the close of the war. After the fall of New Orleans, Thomas Overton Moore was to be the Chief Executive of only a part of the State of Louisiana.

#### CHAPTER V

##### GOVERNOR OF CONFEDERATE LOUISIANA

(April 26, 1862-January 18, 1864)

Capital moved to Opelousas—Moore orders cotton and tobacco destroyed—request for a commanding general for Louisiana—organization of Partisan Rangers for state defense—complaints of seizure of arms and ammunition belonging to the state—meeting of Governors to make recommendations for the defense of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas—General Holmes sent to command the Trans-Mississippi Department—creation of the Department of West Louisiana under command of General Richard Taylor—Legislature in special session, December, 1862—legislation enacted at this session—regular session of the General Assembly, May, 1863—Governor's message—recommends military laws be amended—laws passed at this session—the capture of Vicksburg—convention of Governors to draft plans for defense of the Confederacy west of the Mississippi River—civil and economic conditions in Louisiana during war—Governor Moore's farewell address—Henry Watkins Allen inaugurated as Governor.

With the capture of New Orleans in April, 1862, plans were made to remove the capital of the state from Baton Rouge to Opelousas. The Governor issued orders that all the state archives should be packed and loaded on the steamboat "General Hodges." When it was ascertained that the boat did not have sufficient room to carry the archives of the state, the Governor gave orders that ninety barrels of molasses should be thrown overboard to make room for the archives.<sup>1</sup> Governor Moore paid with his own private funds for the part of the cargo thus thrown overboard.

<sup>1</sup> T. O. Moore to L. M. Durr and Company, July 17, 1862 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

When the Governor saw that the depredations of the enemy would reach even farther into the interior than New Orleans, he demanded that all cotton, tobacco, and any other supplies which were likely to fall into enemy hands should be burned. The destruction of such supplies, he said, should be performed by the militia officers in each parish or by order of the Police Jury. Moore thought that some cotton might be hauled to the interior out of reach of the enemy. "My object," said the Governor, "in issuing this order, is to systematize their efforts and ensure the general and complete destruction of the crop, rather than permit it to fall into the hands of our foes." Moore admonished the citizens not to lose hope of ultimate victory even though the chief port city of the state was in the hands of the enemy. He did not attempt to depreciate the success of the enemy, but at the same time he called upon all the citizens of Louisiana to do all in their power to render that success as fruitless and as short-lived as possible.<sup>2</sup>

Conditions, both economic and military, steadily grew worse as the year 1862 passed. The urgent needs of his state and his people during this trying period weighed heavily upon the Governor. In a letter to President Davis, he stated that part of the state was in the hands of the enemy and that the remainder was a prey to internal dissension and strife. This state of affairs Governor Moore thought was due in part to the disorganized condition of the Confederate forces. At that time, he said, there was only one Confederate officer in the state of Louisiana; and he pleaded that a general be sent to the state to relieve him of the arduous military tasks devolving upon him. In concluding his letter, Governor Moore wrote:

I have sent more than 30,000 men into the field, every-one fully armed and equipped, have clothed them since they have been there; have given all the arms I bought to the Confederate troops, and have now in this calamity, not an officer to advise with or a man to execute an order. I beg that a General may be sent. . . .<sup>3</sup>

In the absence of a commanding officer in Louisiana Moore continued to be the military chief as well as Governor. To supply his troops he gave an order for guns and munitions. These were being sent to the interior of the state when the Federal forces

<sup>2</sup> Proclamation, Executive Office (Baton Rouge), April 25, 1862, in *Alexandria Louisiana Democrat*, April 30, 1862.

<sup>3</sup> T. O. Moore to President Davis, May 21, 1862, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. XV, p. 740.

seized them, there being 350,000 pounds of powder and 4,500 muskets.<sup>4</sup> In another letter to President Davis, Governor Moore stated that the fort at Grand Caillou had been evacuated on April 27 by order of Major General Lovell, the guns spiked and the powder thrown into the river. This evacuation occurred eleven days prior to the appearance of the enemy. Governor Moore complained that this was the way in which all the forts in Louisiana had been given up. In each case there was ample time to have saved the arms and powder before the arrival of the foe, if the situation had been properly handled. In conclusion, he wrote: "If for these acts some of the officers are not cashiered or shot, we need not expect either a brave or a well-disciplined army."<sup>5</sup>

Holding little hope that aid would come from the Confederacy, Governor Moore proceeded to organize the state forces under his command. Companies of troops called "Partisan Rangers" were organized. By the first of July, 1862, the Governor had gathered an army from within the state. When these men were enrolled, they were assigned to camps for training. These camps were located at Opelousas and at Monroe. In addition to a shortage of camps and officers to train the Rangers, there were no supplies for taking care of an army. The Governor requested a commissary officer, saying, ". . . let me, therefore, in passing ask and beg that in appointing a quartermaster to this place you will send not an honest one, that would be an impossibility—but one that will not take more than a half of what I may get together."<sup>6</sup>

At the same time Governor Moore wrote the Confederate Secretary of War at Richmond, stating that he was organizing the Rangers with the hope and expectation that the Confederate government would agree to accept them. To have delayed the organization of these troops until permission could have come from Richmond, the Governor thought would have seriously endangered the defenses of his state.<sup>7</sup> In his letter Governor Moore enclosed a list of thirty-seven companies which he had organized. To equip these troops the Governor ordered 2,720 rifles and a supply of ammunition; but when these arms and munitions arrived within the Confederate lines, General Van Dorn appro-

<sup>4</sup> Moore to Davis, May 21, 1862, in *ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. II, p. 657.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Moore to Davis, June 11, 1862, in *ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. LIII, p. 812.

<sup>7</sup> Moore to Randolph, Secretary of War, June 13, 1862, in *ibid.*, 813.



priated them for the use of his troops. In complaining to the Secretary of War, Governor Moore wrote: "Am I never to get my own property? I hope you will order your officers to return at once the materials of war they have taken that this state paid for its own defense. The Confederacy has never sent me a musket. Let it not take what I have paid for."<sup>8</sup> The Secretary of War in reply stated that the arms seized were being forwarded to the state and henceforth the Confederate government would agree to seize no more military supplies ordered by the state.<sup>9</sup>

In the desperate effort to obtain the absolute essentials of war, Governor Moore again wrote the Secretary of War concerning the confiscated arms. He said he hoped that he was not causing any unnecessary trouble; but he felt that the state should be allowed the use of that which its own money had purchased. The Governor pointed out in his letter how necessary it was for sufficient troops to be stationed within Louisiana. He said: "The army of the Mississippi Valley is wholly dependent for supplies on keeping open our communications with Texas. A few troops thrown out by Butler . . . would completely block us from our supplies for the army."<sup>10</sup> Moore stated that he understood that one part of Louisiana was under the command of General Herbert of Texas and the other parts under command of generals located at Little Rock, Arkansas, and Jackson, Mississippi, respectively. This situation he believed to be worse than having no commanding officer at all. In the latter part of his letter, the Governor said that he understood General Price was coming to the state as commander, and he added, "I care not who you send, so that he be a General to command in this State of Louisiana whose headquarters will be accessible to me."<sup>11</sup>

In July, 1862, Governor Moore met with the Governors of Texas and Arkansas to "confer together . . . as to their wants and necessities." In their communication with President Davis, the Governors recommended these things which the Confederacy might do to strengthen the defenses of the states west of the Mississippi River. Their recommendations included: (1) A commanding general who would have territorial jurisdiction over all the states west of the Mississippi River; (2) a branch of the

<sup>8</sup> Same to same, June 25, 1862, in *ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. XV, p. 766.

<sup>9</sup> Secretary of War to Moore, June 27, 1862, in *ibid.*, 768-769.

<sup>10</sup> Moore to Randolph, July 8, 1862 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

Confederate treasury should be established west of the Mississippi River to facilitate the payment of government expenses; and (3) a supply of small arms should be sent to the states west of the Mississippi.<sup>12</sup> In reply to these recommendations, President Davis stated that it would be impossible to send a general as all officers were then needed in Virginia. The Confederate Constitution did not permit him to establish a branch of the treasury wherever the President willed. And, as for arms he stated that he had shipped about the number asked for in the letter.<sup>13</sup>

After repeated attempts had been made by Governor Moore to secure a commanding officer for Louisiana he partially succeeded when, early in May, 1862, all Confederate territory west of the Mississippi was designated as the Trans-Mississippi Department.<sup>14</sup> In July, 1862, General T. H. Holmes was placed in command of this department with his headquarters at Little Rock.<sup>15</sup> However, this plan of organization did not completely satisfy Governor Moore. Writing to the Secretary of War, he said: "I have begged for an officer, and the Government answers me by attaching my State to the command of a General whose headquarters are in Little Rock." He further said he had not been informed that a general had any command over the state except that a raid had been made at Alexandria by a detachment of Confederate forces claiming to act under authority of the commanding officer at Little Rock. In conclusion the Governor wrote:

I have ordered a force of militia at Alexandria to prevent any similar raid. I have directed that any similar expedition shall not only be stopped, but the whole party arrested, and if their boat will not stop I have cannon planted to fire into her and sink her. I have selected men to command this force who are fully impressed with the indignities we have suffered and who will carry out my orders.<sup>16</sup>

After the creation of the Trans-Mississippi Department there was a general shifting of Confederate troops and officers to the states west of the Mississippi. In August, 1862, Major General Richard ("Dick") Taylor<sup>17</sup> was made commanding offi-

<sup>12</sup> Rowland, *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, V, 301.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, V, 342.

<sup>14</sup> S. Cooper, "General Orders No. 39," May 26, 1862, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. IX, p. 713.

<sup>15</sup> Secretary of War, "Special Orders No. 164," July 16, 1862, in *ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. XIII, p. 855.

<sup>16</sup> Moore to Secretary of War, July 8, 1862 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>17</sup> Son of former President Zachary Taylor.

cer of the Department of West Louisiana.<sup>18</sup> When the commanding officer arrived to take charge of military affairs, Governor Moore cooperated with him wholeheartedly. An additional military training camp was established at New Iberia. When General Taylor arrived in Louisiana, he found very little of the necessities of war. Guns, powder, and other munitions were scarcely to be had at any price. Most of the troops raised in the state had been sent elsewhere to fight and those that were left behind were badly organized. The Partisan Rangers, organized by the Governor in June, 1862, for state protection, was the army which greeted the commanding general of the Department of West Louisiana.<sup>19</sup> With the cooperation of Governor Moore, General Dick Taylor was able to muster only 4,697 men into the service by October 1, 1862.<sup>20</sup> Desertion and violation of furlough were often resorted to in order to escape military duty. To remedy this situation General Taylor suggested to Governor Moore that he issue orders for the arrest of all men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five years who were not legally exempt from military service.<sup>21</sup> When the Governor received Taylor's letter he ordered that

Commanders of regiments and sheriffs of parishes will cause the immediate arrest of all deserters and enrolled conscripts who have not reported, and all others, between the ages of 18 and 35 who may be found within the limits of their respective regiments or parishes, and are unable to furnish evidence that they are legally exempt from service.<sup>22</sup>

Governor Moore urged the Confederate government to complete the railroad from the military camp at New Iberia to Houston, Texas. He also recommended to President Davis the necessity of having heavy guns supplied for the defense of Red River against the enemy. For carrying into effect this latter proposal, the Governor was successful in obtaining four pieces of heavy artillery. The engineer in charge of the fortifications on Red River was Colonel DeRussy.<sup>23</sup>

The presence of Confederate military officers in Louisiana after July, 1862, took from the Governor many duties which until

<sup>18</sup> Richard Taylor, *Destruction and Reconstruction: Personal Experiences of the Late War* (New York, 1879), 99.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 110.

<sup>20</sup> Abstracts of Taylor's Forces, October 1, 1862, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. XV, p. 820.

<sup>21</sup> Taylor to Moore, November 21, 1862, in *ibid.*, 782.

<sup>22</sup> Executive Order No. 9031, November 21, 1862, in *ibid.*, 784.

<sup>23</sup> Rowland, *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist*, X, 381.



that time he had attempted to execute. However, Governor Moore never ceased to cooperate with the Confederate commanders in securing arms, munitions, and other materials of war. Agents sent by the Governor to Mexico were able to purchase powder and arms but could not secure transportation of these supplies to Louisiana.<sup>24</sup> In order to provide more ample defense of the state, Governor Moore requested President Davis to have two additional brigades sent to Louisiana to augment those forces under General Taylor. In describing the conditions in Louisiana, the Governor stated that 50,000 slaves were in Federal hands and in many instances the enemy was operating the sugar plantations. Writing with his usual frankness, Governor Moore said:

What has been done for Louisiana? Nothing was done at New Orleans but sending a general there, and nothing more is being done now. The universal public mind is depressed at our defenseless state, and to this feeling is added the feeling of soreness and bitterness that had been occasioned by neglect. The painful discussion is often heard in private circles . . . how much better defended Louisiana would have been if she had preserved her independent sovereignty and employed her 35,000 soldiers and her millions of treasure now gone, to the defense of her chief city and her conquered soil.<sup>25</sup>

With hope gone that further aid would come from Richmond, Governor Moore issued a proclamation convening the Legislature in special session "to consider and provide for the exigencies of public defense."<sup>26</sup>

Although there is available no record of Governor Moore's address to this special session of the General Assembly, it may possibly be presumed that he did admonish the lawmakers to enact legislation which would facilitate an adequate defense of that part of the state not under the jurisdiction of the enemy. There was a unity of action between the Governor and the Legislature in making preparations for home defense. Hardly a fortnight had passed until a bill was introduced, passed by both houses and signed by the Governor, providing for the defense of Red River, the main artery of transportation in the state. This act was unique in that it provided for the use of slaves in the

<sup>24</sup> J. L. Macaulay to Thomas O. Moore, April 14, 1863 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>25</sup> Moore to President Davis, December 1, 1862, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. LIII, p. 836.

<sup>26</sup> Executive Proclamation, December 15, 1862, in *ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. VI, p. 25.

construction of the defense works. This is the first record of slave labor being employed in a semi-military capacity by the state. The terms of the act provided for an Executive Committee composed of individuals from the several parishes bordering upon the Red River. It was made the duty of this committee to erect or cause to be erected any fortifications which they might deem expedient for the protection of navigation on Red River. To facilitate the project the Police Jury of each parish was to levy and collect a tax commensurate with the financial requirements of the project undertaken. The act further provided that the president of each parish Police Jury should cause to be compiled a list of all the able-bodied slaves between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years within its jurisdiction. Notice would be given the owners or overseers of slaves, by the president of the Police Jury, as to the number required for any fortification to be erected. In addition to the employment of slaves, without the consent of their owners, the act also empowered the Police Juries to demand sustenance, working tools and instruments, carts, boats, wagons, oxen, mules and horses, and such other materials as were necessary in erecting the desired fortifications. Provision was made that if any person or persons failed to comply with the demands of the police juries in this matter, then it became the duty of the nearest competent militia officer to cause the arrest of such person or persons.<sup>27</sup>

As a further means of securing adequate defense for the state, the Governor was empowered to press into service one-half of the male slave population of the state. This law further bestowed upon the Governor the power to use such movable private property as in his estimation might be needed in working the slaves. The sheriff of each parish was to furnish a list of all the male slaves living within the parish. In case any master or overseer failed to furnish the slaves requested by the Governor, such owner or overseer was liable to a fine of \$500 for each day his slaves should fail to attend.<sup>28</sup>

To augment the military forces of the state the age limit for service was altered so as to make liable for military duty all free white males between the ages of seventeen and fifty years. This act reduced very materially the legal exemptions from military service.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>27</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1862-63), Act 5, p. 5.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 10, p. 10.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 42, p. 36.

Legislation designed "to raise an army for the defense of Louisiana" empowered the Governor to raise an army whose number was never to exceed 20,000. The men were to be enlisted for a period of twelve months, unless sooner discharged. To stimulate enlistment under this act the law provided that each soldier was to receive a bounty of fifty dollars and a title to eighty acres of land within the state. The forces raised under provisions of this act were not liable for military service outside the borders of the state.<sup>30</sup>

In order to provide financial means for carrying into effect the various acts relating to the defense of the state, passed at this session, the General Assembly made an appropriation of \$13,000,000 or so much thereof as might be necessary to finance the several military provisions.<sup>31</sup>

At this session of the Legislature the seat of government was changed to Shreveport, and there it remained until the close of the war.<sup>32</sup> Federal invasion of southwestern Louisiana had endangered the safety of the town of Opelousas.

The Legislature had scarcely adjourned when Federal troops inaugurated the Red River campaign of 1863. Plans for the defense of Red River, as contemplated by the Governor and the Legislature at the recent session, had not sufficient time to mature. Governor Moore, acting under provisions of the law providing an army for state defense, issued orders that the enrolling officers were to begin immediately to enroll all free white male citizens of the state between the ages of seventeen and fifty.<sup>33</sup> In various parts of the state there was trouble in putting into execution the provisions of the new military act. Desertion and even open rebellion was not uncommon in some instances. In Washington Parish a group of seventy-five men banded together for mutual protection from the military authorities declared openly that they would rather die than serve in the army of the Confederacy.<sup>34</sup> Even further trouble confronted Governor Moore in his attempt to enroll the able-bodied men into the army contemplated by the military act of December, 1862. The act

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 21, pp. 18-21.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 34, p. 31.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 33, p. 30.

<sup>33</sup> Executive Order, Alexandria, January 13, 1863, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. LIII, p. 843.

<sup>34</sup> Letter signed "Boston Traveller" found by the Federals after the capture of Port Hudson, Louisiana, in *ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. VII, p. 94.



was so drawn up and worded as to cause a great deal of uncertainty as to the length of time the soldiers were to serve in this newly-created army.<sup>35</sup>

Despite the adversities which beset the Governor, he continued to work with unabated zeal in the performance of the manifold duties of commander-in-chief of the armed forces of his state. Firm though Governor Moore was in enforcing the provisions of all the military acts, he was not devoid of sympathy and understanding of the needs of those left at home. He granted a request of certain citizens of Rapides Parish that certain men should remain at home until the crops had been harvested.<sup>36</sup>

Realizing that certain alterations were necessary in the act for raising a military force for the defense of the state, Governor Moore issued a proclamation convening the Legislature at Shreveport on the first Monday in May, 1863. A report was made early in the session that nineteen parishes of the state were in the hands of the Federal troops. It was with great difficulty, because of this occupation by the enemy, that the General Assembly secured the attendance of the necessary number to constitute a quorum.<sup>37</sup>

In his address to the Legislature the Governor stated that it was well that the legislators had seen fit to change the time of meeting, "as subjects of grave import demand your attention." He stated that the first item of importance was to amend the military law enacted at the last session. "In every step of my efforts to put these acts into practical operation, I have met with difficulties," said the Governor. Chief among these difficulties was the attempt to evade military duty. However, he explained that he was prepared to meet these obstacles from the experience he had in putting the State Conscript Law into effect. That some of the objections were made honestly the Governor did not doubt. Some objections, he believed, came from patriotic citizens who did not think all the men should be taken from agricultural pursuits and placed in military camps. The Governor sympathized with these men, but he said, "the objections which

<sup>35</sup> *Semi-Weekly Shreveport News*, April 15, 1863.

<sup>36</sup> Taylor to Moore, December 11, 1862 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>37</sup> *Semi-Weekly Shreveport News*, June 9, 1863.

they urged in good faith were industriously repeated by less worthy persons, and made the pretext for avoiding the service required."<sup>38</sup>

At this point he informed the Legislature that since the beginning of hostilities Louisiana had furnished the Confederacy 50,000 men fully clothed and equipped. This, he said, was equal to the highest number of votes ever polled in any state election. From the beginning of the war Governor Moore had considered it the duty of Louisiana to contribute to the general good of the Confederacy, trusting that it would in turn send aid to Louisiana when it was needed. Even though the state had been neglected by the Confederate government, he admonished the people not to begrudge their contributions. He said: "Our generosity has, however, deprived us in great part of our resources for home defense, and this privation constitutes the main obstacle to the successful operation of your late military enactments."<sup>39</sup>

From the beginning of the war the Governor had been entrusted with the expenditure of all money appropriated by the state for purely military purposes. This, the Governor stated, had imposed upon him many arduous duties which might be assumed by other state officers. He therefore recommended that for the duration of the war all money expended by the state for military purposes should be under the supervision and direction of the Quartermaster General and other disbursing officers. Such money as was spent for this purpose should be drawn from the State Treasury by means of vouchers. The Governor also requested that the Legislature appoint a committee to which he might submit a report of all money paid out by him in executing the late military laws.<sup>40</sup>

In response to the recommendations of the Governor that certain changes be made in the military acts, the Legislature enacted two new military laws very stringent and binding upon the citizens of Louisiana. The first of these empowered the Chief Executive to raise troops for the defense of the state by volunteer enlistment. Those who volunteered under this act were to serve three, six or twelve months, or so much thereof as the exigencies of the service, in the opinion of the Governor, required.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> "Governor's Message," in *ibid.*, June 12, 1863.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>41</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1863), Act 44, p. 36.

The recommendations concerning the militia law which the Governor had made in his message were incorporated into an act entitled "an act to organize the militia of the State and to repeal the act organizing the militia for the defense of the State, approved third of January, 1863." The scope of this militia law far exceeded any previous enactment which related to those subject to armed service. By its terms all the white male residents of the state, between the ages of seventeen and fifty years, not in the actual civil or military service of the Confederate States, and all foreigners or citizens of other Confederate States, who had resided sixty days within the state, were subject to call under this law. Provisions were also made that under no circumstances were substitutes for military duty to be allowed. The number of persons eligible for exemptions was greatly reduced. As an example of the comprehensiveness of the law on this subject, the head of a family who had as many as ten children dependent upon him for support would be exempt. A tanner who upon sworn affidavit could show that he had as many as five hundred hides in tan at the time of enactment of the law was likewise exempt. To secure a list of those liable to service under the act the Governor appointed an enrolling agent in each parish, charged with the duty of placing in the hands of the Governor, within forty days after the passage of the act, a complete roll of all residents of his parish subject to the provisions of the militia law. As a penalty for failure to comply with the terms of this law the offender would be court-martialed.<sup>42</sup>

The Legislature empowered Governor Moore to accept bids for the construction of two ironclad gunboats. To defray the expense of building these boats he was allowed \$1,000,000 or as much thereof as was necessary. When they were completed he was authorized to sell them to the Confederacy, but for no less than their actual cost of construction.<sup>43</sup>

Having complied with every recommendation made by Governor Moore, the Legislature adjourned in June, 1863. As commander-in-chief of the militia of the state, the Governor seems to have had the confidence of the Legislature as to his ability and competence to discharge the duties of this position. A study of the military legislation passed during his term of office

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 51, p. 42.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 34, p. 28.



reveals no instance in which the General Assembly failed to comply with the recommendations made by Governor Moore in this matter.

The fall of Vicksburg on July 4, 1863, proved the blow which geographically divided the Confederacy. From this time on until the close of the war communication with that portion of the Confederacy east of the Mississippi was maintained with the greatest difficulty. With the Mississippi River controlled by the enemy from St. Louis to New Orleans, war materials and men could not be sent to aid the states west of the Mississippi. In August, 1863, Governor Moore attended a conference at Marshall, Texas, at which were present the Governors of Arkansas, Missouri and Texas, as well as General E. Kirby-Smith, Commander of the Trans-Mississippi Department. This conference was held to take into consideration the situation arising as a result of the capture of Vicksburg. Governor Moore voted with his colleagues to give the commanding general extraordinary powers in his conduct of the war.<sup>44</sup>

In an address signed by the Governors present and delivered at the conference it was pointed out that the region composing the Trans-Mississippi Department was in a position to defend itself against invasion by an enemy. Concerning this subject, the address stated: "With our own manufactories of cannon, arms, powder, and other munitions of war, with mines opened and factories established, with cotton as a basis for financial measures, and with an abundance of food, we are able to conduct a vigorous defense against the enemy." A Committee of Public Safety was organized whose purpose was "by committees of correspondence and voluntary associations in every parish and county, we hope to unite our patriotic citizens in a vigorous support of the Confederate and State Authorities in defense of our families and homes."<sup>45</sup> Little is known of the part Governor Moore may have had in the deliberations of this civil and military conference at Marshall, Texas. However, the address signed by the Governors present embodies a style of writing as well as content of thought very similar to previous public papers written by Governor Moore.

During the remainder of his term as Governor, Moore seems to have been content to let the prosecution of military campaigns

<sup>44</sup> *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. LIII, p. 892 ff.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

in Louisiana rest in the hands of the commanding general. It should not be supposed, however, that he was indifferent to the vital necessity of marshaling the manpower of his state in an attempt to repulse the advances of the enemy. A major portion of his farewell message to the Legislature, in January, 1864, deals with ways and means of strengthening local defenses. On this subject Governor Moore said: "Everyone must render his service either in augmenting the military strength . . . or in developing by industrial energy those material resources which are as indispensable for the efficiency of the army as are trained soldiers." He went on to say that the Confederate Congress should repeal the law allowing substitutes to be furnished by conscripts. He commended the Congress for authorizing the formation of companies called "Minute Men." These were composed of men not within the conscript age limits. Such companies, in the Governor's opinion, which might also be raised by the states, would render very efficient military service. "I urge upon the people of this State the necessity and feasibility of strengthening our local defenses by the formation of these companies," said the Governor.<sup>46</sup>

In reviewing his position as commander-in-chief of the state militia, Governor Moore said he had adhered to the policy of mustering the state troops into the Confederate army as quickly as possible. In following this uniform procedure he thought better results could be realized for the general welfare. In concluding that part of his message devoted to military affairs, Governor Moore said:

To whatever General was entrusted the defense of our State, I have given my hearty and unflagging support in the supply of arms, of munitions of war, of Commissariat and Quartermaster stores—by loans from the Military Fund entrusted to me, by the prosecution of military works at the sole expense of the State—not hindered by a fear of extravagance where the object manifestly justified it, but at the same time keeping a watchful eye upon expenditures. Thus the resources of the State and of the Confederate Government are concentrated upon the one object of augmenting our military strength.<sup>47</sup>

Thus in his own words are summed up Governor Thomas Overton Moore's activities in the discharge of his military duties.

<sup>46</sup> Governor's Farewell Message, January 18, 1864 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

*Civil and Economic*

Until the capture of New Orleans in April, 1862, the civilians of the state had probably considered the war as one to be waged in other territory. Except for the blockade and thereby the inability to sell cotton the normal intrastate trade channels were kept open. It is true that prices for certain luxuries and even necessities of life had advanced, but most of these were dispensed with or substitutes found. However, the loss of the state's leading city soon dispelled from the minds of those at home any hallucinations they may have entertained as to the glory of war. The cotton, which had been stored until the blockade should be lifted, was burned or thrown into the river. Tobacco, naval stores, and all other materials which might give aid to the enemy were destroyed.<sup>48</sup> This was only a beginning of the many privations and hardships which the citizens loyal to the Confederacy were destined to suffer.

Governor Moore was quick to perceive that the people in the immediate vicinity of New Orleans and in the parishes adjacent thereto were carrying on open commercial intercourse with the Federal forces. To warn the loyal citizens that such trade was illegal he issued an order that trade with the enemy of any amount must cease. Those who were apprehended in the act of violating the provisions of the order were to be considered enemies of the Confederacy.<sup>49</sup>

In his first attempt to curb this nefarious practice Governor Moore pointed out the patriotic reasons why those loyal to the Confederacy should desist from any such acts. Failing in his first attempt to realize the desired ends, he delivered an address, from the capitol at Opelousas, in which he prohibited any trade or communication with the enemy.<sup>50</sup> In this address he outlines in detail the rules of conduct which all loyal citizens should follow, calling them "rules which will not be relaxed." These rules were as follows: (1) Trading with the enemy was prohibited under all circumstances; (2) traveling to and from New Orleans, and other places occupied by the enemy, was forbidden and all passengers so doing would be arrested; (3) citi-

<sup>48</sup> Secretary of War to Major General Lovell, May 21, 1862, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. XV, p. 741.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 759.

<sup>50</sup> An Address by Moore, June 18, 1862 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University). Also Jessie A. Marshall (ed.), *Private and Official Correspondence of General Benjamin F. Butler, during the Period of the Civil War*, 5 vols. (Norwood, Mass., 1917), II, 16-24.



zens going to these places and returning with enemy passports would be arrested; (4) Confederate notes were at all times to be received in payment of debts or obligations; and (5) provisions might be sent to New Orleans only in charge of an officer authorized by the state for such purpose.<sup>51</sup>

On the subject of trading with the enemy, the Governor said:

There cannot be a war for arms and a peace for trade between two people at the same time. The armed occupants of that city are our enemy. To each loyal citizen of Louisiana and of the Confederacy, every citizen of the country hostile to us is our enemy. . . . We cannot exchange our corn, cattle, sugar, or cotton for their gold. . . . It is a rule recognized as imperative by all writers on public law, and universally administered by authorities of nations at war.<sup>52</sup>

Among other motives prompting Governor Moore to prohibit all such intercourse was a clause contained in passports given by the enemy to those having ingress and egress to New Orleans, to the effect that the bearer would not in any manner lend his aid or assistance to the Confederacy. Concerning such passports, the Governor said:

It has come to my knowledge that some people have gone into New Orleans voluntarily, and without any apparent or avowed purpose to accomplish, save a gratification of an idle curiosity, and have since returned with passports. When required to perform militia duty afterwards . . . they present the passport in which the Federal officer has assumed a promise that the holder will not countenance or aid this Government. If he does not countenance or aid this Government then he must necessarily recognize the pretension of those who seek to crush it. . . . The Confederacy and the State recognize but two classes—its friends and its foes.<sup>53</sup>

The Governor warned that he was issuing orders to the military officers to arrest all such persons claiming military exemption on grounds of the passport, and when tried and convicted such offenders should suffer capital punishment.

Since the occupation of New Orleans by the enemy many boats had been seized to be used in raiding operations. The Governor ordered that no boats should go to that city from

<sup>51</sup> An Address by Moore, June 18, 1862 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

Confederate territory, and when it was evident there was danger of any boats falling into possession of the foe such boats should be destroyed.<sup>54</sup>

In response to numerous pleas sent him by the loyal citizens of New Orleans, who were in need of provisions and supplies, the Governor said he had decided to allow two men to take such provisions as were necessary for the welfare of needy citizens of that city. However, this plan was to be discontinued if there was evidence that such supplies were being used to give aid to the enemy.<sup>55</sup>

The latter part of this lengthy address by the Governor was given over to an attempt to arouse the patriotism of his people and to imbue them with hope of ultimate success in their struggle. He pleaded with the people to give all possible aid and assistance to the work of organizing the Partisan Rangers whose duty it would be to protect their homes. In conclusion, he pleaded as follows:

Let every citizen be an armed sentinel to give warning of any approach of the insolent foe. Let all our river banks swarm with patriots, to teach the hated invader that the rifle will be his only welcome on his errands of plunder and destruction. Wherever he dares to raise the hated emblem of tyranny tear it down and rip it to tatters.<sup>56</sup>

On May 15, 1862, General Benjamin F. Butler, the Federal commanding officer at New Orleans, issued an order which in substance stated that, should the ladies of that city continue to insult and show contempt for the Federal soldiers, those guilty of such conduct were to be treated as "women of the streets plying their trade." When the news of this infamous order reached the capitol at Opelousas, Governor Moore delivered one of the most stirring addresses of his entire career. Realizing probably that nothing could have happened which would tend more to incite his people to a display of loyalty and patriotism, the Governor did not fail to use the opportunity to its utmost. To show the bitter tone of this address, it may serve well to quote a passage therefrom:

History records the instances of cities being sacked and inhuman atrocities committed upon the women of a conquered town, but in no instance in modern times, at

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*

least without the brutal ravishers suffering condign punishment from the hands of their commander. . . . Louisianians! Will you allow such foul conduct of your oppressors to pass unpunished? Will you permit such indignities to remain unavenged? A mind so debased as to be capable of conceiving the alternative presented in this order must be fruitful of inventions to pollute humanity. Shameless enough to allow their publication in the city, by the countenance of such atrocities they will be multiplied in the country. Its inhabitants must arm and strike, or the insolent visitors will offer this outrage to your wives, your sisters, and your daughters.<sup>57</sup>

Despite the numerous appeals to patriotism and loyalty made by Governor Moore, trading with the enemy and other forbidden practices were continued. Spies and salaried informers of the enemy were constant visitors to that part of Louisiana not under Federal control. In not a few instances men who were actuated by economic motives rather than by patriotism shipped cotton to New Orleans and sold it to the enemy. Hoping to put a stop to this illicit traffic, Governor Moore ordered all cotton stored on the banks of the Black, Tensas, Ouachita, and Trinity rivers to be burned.<sup>58</sup> In other sections of the state arrests were made of persons acting as commission agents for the Federal troops.<sup>59</sup> There were many who, encouraged by the enemy, refused to accept Confederate money in payment of obligations. Such persons, said the Governor, were to be arrested and warned that such action would be considered as aid to the enemy. Persons who were guilty of this offense for the second time were placed in prison and remained there until the Governor saw fit to order their release.<sup>60</sup>

Although the special session of the Legislature which met from December, 1862, to January, 1863, at Opelousas was called primarily to take into consideration the defense of the state, it seems to have devoted no small portion of its time to the enactment of economic measures designed to aid the families of soldiers. No record is available of the recommendations which Governor Moore made to the General Assembly at this time, but one may assume that the measures enacted were in accord with the desires of the Governor, inasmuch as he affixed his signa-

<sup>57</sup> Message, Moore "To the People of Louisiana," in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. XV, pp. 743-744.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. XXV, p. 761.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, Series 1, Vol. XV, p. 753.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 772.



ture to each of the acts passed. An act designed to aid the dependents of soldiers provided that such dependents should receive a monthly cash allowance from the state. The amount to be received in any case depended upon the necessitous condition of the recipient and the number of dependents in each family. The wife of a soldier in the Confederate or state military service received ten dollars per month with an additional five dollars for each child under twelve years of age. The act also provided that those families who were entitled to such compensation but who were located in parishes controlled by the enemy might draw their pay from the parish nearest them not in control of the enemy.<sup>61</sup>

It was during this special session that Governor Moore affixed his signature to an act relative to the legal action which might be taken in suits concerning "debts and damages." By its terms all laws providing for the prescription of mortgages and privileges to secure the payment of sums of money were suspended until one year after the ratification of a treaty of peace between the Confederate States and the United States.<sup>62</sup>

As a further means of giving governmental protection to the property of private citizens the General Assembly made it unlawful to sell property within the enemy's lines for taxes. Those buying land or other property under such conditions were liable to a forfeit of claim to any such possessions so acquired.<sup>63</sup> A supplementary act which was to provide a remedy for recovery of possession of confiscated property within the state was enacted. By the provisions of this act anyone claiming to hold land within the state as a result of an act of the United States government since January 26, 1861, was dispossessed of any title or claim to such land.<sup>64</sup>

Because of the acute economic distress existing in the state at this time, the Legislature passed an act which further postponed the collection of state taxes until February 1, 1864.<sup>65</sup> The inability of the state to collect taxes due made it necessary to enact legislation for the relief of the State Treasury. This was done by permitting Governor Moore to issue treasury notes to

<sup>61</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1862-63), Act 45, pp. 35-36.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 2, p. 3.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 7, p. 7.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 11, pp. 11-12.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 22, p. 20.

the amount of \$20,000,000. These notes did not bear interest and were redeemable twelve months after a treaty of peace should be signed.<sup>66</sup>

As hostilities in Louisiana progressed it became increasingly difficult for the civil government of the state to operate successfully. After the Red River campaign of 1863 there were nineteen parishes of the state controlled by the Federal forces.<sup>67</sup> When the Legislature met in regular session at Shreveport on May 4, 1863, the Governor found only ten members of the body present. These ten members continued to meet each day, only to adjourn because of the lack of a quorum. Under these conditions the Speaker of the House of Representatives served notice that unless a quorum was present by May 6, he would move that a majority of those present should constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.<sup>68</sup> However, on Wednesday, May 6, a quorum was mustered and Governor Moore delivered his message to the General Assembly.

The Governor's message outlined the many problems which were confronting the Legislature and the Executive at that time. Chief among these problems, and that first mentioned in the message, was the control of the currency. Throughout his term Governor Moore proved himself to be an able student of financial affairs, but in no instance did he more ably demonstrate his sound knowledge on such matters than in this message. He told the legislators that of the \$20,000,000 of treasury notes which he had been authorized to issue only one half the amount had been placed in circulation. He recommended that the remaining ten millions not be printed, as he thought it would produce an over-inflation of the already depreciated currency. He also recommended that the Legislature prohibit the issue of notes by parishes, corporations, or individuals unless the same were fully covered by state or Confederate treasury notes.<sup>69</sup>

The Governor stated that, as a measure to stabilize the currency, the Confederate government had suggested that the governments of the several states should endorse the bonds of the Confederacy, with each state guaranteeing the ultimate payment of any amount proportional to its representation in Congress.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 32, p. 34.

<sup>67</sup> *Semi-Weekly Shreveport News*, June 12, 1863.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, June 9, 1863.

<sup>69</sup> "The Governor's Message," in *ibid.*, June 12, 1863.

He was of the opinion that such action was equivalent to the states assuming the entire debt contracted by the general government. Furthermore, he maintained that such an act would be unconstitutional; and even though it were not, such a course would be unwise. Though he was reluctant to recommend this course, he stated: "Our duty is to maintain . . . credit with the utmost care."<sup>70</sup>

Governor Moore concurred with the opinion of the State Auditor that the law relating to the collection of state taxes should be either repealed altogether or materially amended.

At its last session held in Opelousas the Legislature had appropriated \$5,000,000 to be spent by the Governor in supplying aid to the families of soldiers. The Governor recommended that a considerable portion of these funds should be expended in purchasing cotton cards to be sold to families at cost. In this way he thought such families could be enabled to provide for themselves by the fruits of their own labor and not be made to feel that they were living on charity furnished by the government. If such a policy were adopted, he thought it would promote the manufacturing of clothing materials which at that time were very scarce.<sup>71</sup>

For the second time the Governor suggested the advisability of an act which would prohibit the distillation of sugar, molasses, and breadstuffs into spirituous liquors. This might be done by preventing its manufacture or by placing such a high tax upon the product that it would produce the same result. The Governor stated that even though it was true that current indications were for a crop which would be abundant for the needs both at home and in the field, it was also possible that a severe shortage of foodstuffs might be caused by a drought.<sup>72</sup>

A portion of the message dealt with the importance of preserving the state government. The Governor pointed out that it was vitally necessary to preserve the machinery of state government intact and in full operation in every branch. If this were not done, he said, it would be paraded by the enemy as an evidence of success, and an excuse to formulate a *de facto* government over that portion of the state which might be under their temporary control. As a remedy for this evil, the Governor

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*



stated, some were in favor of a State Convention to alter the organic law. This, he thought, was unwise unless it were possible for all parts of the state to be represented at such convention.<sup>73</sup>

In his concluding remarks, the Governor attempted to inspire his people with hope and confidence for the future. He said:

Annoyed and harassed as our citizens have been, vast as has been our expenditure, tremendous as has been our losses in property, bitter and many as have been our disappointments, and heavy as may be the grief in many thousands of families for the gallant dead who have fallen in the sacred cause of independence—still there appears to me to be good reasons why we should with cheerful confidence look to the future. Human sagacity cannot predict the duration of a war, nor foretell the character and phases it may assume; but whether the present war end soon or late, victory is to be won with endurance; and we know with these motives we have to endure patiently, and at any cost we must eventually wear out the invaders. . . . The day of our triumph must come at last, for there is that in the hearts of our people which no force can overwhelm, no calamity can subdue. Our debt to our country comprises the labor, property, and life of every citizen; if each one of us is willing to pay the whole or any part of this great obligation, failure is utterly impossible.<sup>74</sup>

Before the Legislature adjourned it had enacted into law all the recommendations made by the Governor. At this session the sum of \$300,000 was appropriated "for the relief of destitute citizens and families lately expelled by the federal authorities from New Orleans and vicinity." The act provided that the Governor should appoint one or more commissioners whose duty it would be to distribute the funds among those who were in necessitous circumstances. The relief granted to any one individual was limited to fifty dollars.<sup>75</sup>

An act was passed providing that in future the General Assembly should convene at the seat of government on the third Monday in January in each and every year.<sup>76</sup>

After the Red River campaign of 1863 the price of meat, when it was available at all, and other foods reached a new high. To make the situation even more acute the commanding general,

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>75</sup> *Louisiana Acts* (1863), Act 24, p. 20.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, Act 11, p. 11.

E. Kirby-Smith, had ordered that no more beeves were to be brought into the state from Texas. Prior to this time the civilians of Louisiana had agreed to surrender all meat to the army provided beef might be brought in from Texas. When the order became known to Governor Moore, he complained to General Kirby-Smith of the hardships which such an order was producing. He pointed out that it was the pledge of the commanding officer that meat might be imported from Texas, and that, unless the new order was withdrawn, the entire population, both white and black, would be starving within a short time.<sup>77</sup>

As the elected leader of the civilian population, Governor Moore was quick to champion the cause of those whom he served. In 1863 the Confederate government authorized the military authorities to impress any property of civilians which was necessary in prosecuting the war. Governor Moore was not hesitant in explaining to the people of Louisiana the provisions of this law. He likewise urged all who had knowledge of violations of the law or those who had been mistreated by any military officer in carrying this law into effect to report the matter to him.<sup>78</sup>

Governor Moore delivered his farewell address to the General Assembly at Shreveport on January 18, 1864. This last message contained, as usual, the recommendations which in his opinion should be acted upon for a successful prosecution of the war to which he had devoted so much of his time and attention for the preceding three years. He warned against the ever increasing volume of currency which, in his opinion, should be curtailed in order to prevent bankruptcy of the state and nation. He admonished the lawmakers of the dangers incident to the increase of the amount of state bonds and treasury notes. He also recommended the collection of state taxes in order to provide revenues for the operation of the state governmental agencies.<sup>79</sup>

In concluding his farewell address, Governor Moore said:

In closing this, my last annual message, to the General Assembly, I desire to express, through it to my fellow-citizens of the State an acknowledgment of the leniency they have extended to any errors of my administration. Called to the Executive chair, against my own wishes, I

<sup>77</sup> *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. XXVI, p. 342.

<sup>78</sup> "Governor Moore's Last Address to the General Assembly," January 18, 1864 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

found myself suddenly surrounded by new and formidable perils. Plunged into a war of startling magnitude in which our State was expected to perform no inconsiderable part, I deplored that her helm was entrusted to my untutored hand. How . . . I was oppressed with that responsibility no one will ever fully know. How I have discharged it, posterity will judge, perhaps with less harshness than those of the present day. For myself I can with sincerity say, that nothing could have sustained me under it, but the conscious rectitude of my intentions, and unabated zeal for the success of my country's cause.

Entering now the retirement I have long coveted I invoke the blessing of Providence upon our struggle. Passing through the sharp ordeal of war and suffering, may we learn to value the blessings of Independence, which at no distant day will be secured to Louisiana and the States with which she has confederated.<sup>80</sup>

So ended the gubernatorial career of Louisiana's Secession Governor. Possessed of much ability in statecraft, he never hesitated to employ this ability with diligence in a cause which he thought to be wise and just.

## CHAPTER VI

### EX-GOVERNOR DURING RECONSTRUCTION (1864-1876)

Moore returns to Rapides Parish—condition of plantations—flees to Texas—goes to Mexico with Ex-Governor Allen—leaves Mexico for Cuba—parole and pardon granted—returns to Rapides Parish in 1866—death, June 25, 1876.

When General Henry Watkins Allen had succeeded to the office of Governor in January, 1864, Thomas Overton Moore retired to his plantations to lead the life of a gentleman planter. Serving as Governor of a war-torn, poverty-stricken state had taken its toll of his physical strength and endurance. Nor was the ex-governor to find the same well-ordered, prosperous plantations which he had left four years before. The ravages of war had not left his home immune from the depredations of the enemy. During March, 1863, General Nathaniel Banks, the Federal commander, had made his first Red River campaign.<sup>1</sup> The enemy wrought great havoc at "Mooreland" and "Emfield" plantations. Supplies of all kinds were confiscated, and that which was not taken by the foe was given to the Negroes or

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Davis, "The Life of Richard Taylor," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XXIV (1942), 74.



burned. At the plantation home, "Emfield," the furniture was removed from the house, a part taken by the Negroes for their personal use, and the remainder was so badly damaged that it was of little value. The Federal forces confiscated all food supplies, livestock, and other provisions of any use which were found. Governor Moore lost twenty-eight head of mules, several wagons and carts, and other farm necessities. Moreover, the Federals had told the Negroes they were free, and many of them were enticed to accompany the enemy as he retreated.<sup>2</sup>

Having been deprived of his labor, farming implements, and livestock, there was very little that could be accomplished on the plantation for the remainder of the year. The result of the Red River campaign of 1863 was only a forerunner of what Ex-Governor Moore was to suffer in the following year. In December, 1863, plans were made by the enemy for another campaign up the Red River.<sup>3</sup> On March 15, 1864, Alexandria fell into the hands of the invading forces.<sup>4</sup> It was during this campaign that the severest losses were sustained by Governor Moore. The remaining slaves were induced to plunder and pillage with the aid and protection of the enemy. As in 1863, the plantations were again stripped of livestock, wagons and carts. The cattle, sheep, hogs and goats which were not taken off the place were killed and left to decay in the sun. The furniture in the two plantation homes was set upon by the invaders and soon reduced to utter ruin. When the looting had been completed, orders were issued to set fire to the homes located on "Mooreland" and "Emfield".<sup>5</sup>

Because of his active participation in the war, and motivated by the fact that his remaining slaves would be liberated, the ex-governor thought it wise to leave Louisiana. Consequently, in September, 1864, he migrated to Texas, accompanied by his loyal slaves.<sup>6</sup> In leaving Rapides Parish, Moore left his wife and family behind to manage the plantations there.

Upon reaching Texas, he decided to settle in Houston County, near the town of Crockett.<sup>7</sup> There is no record of his having

<sup>2</sup> John H. Ransdell to T. O. Moore, May 24, 1863 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>3</sup> McPherson to Grant, December 16, 1863, in *Official Records*, Series 1, Vol. XXXI, Part 1, p. 596.

<sup>4</sup> General Richard Taylor to General E. Kirby-Smith, March 15, 1864, in *ibid.*, 495-496.

<sup>5</sup> Related to the author in interview with Mrs. Shirley Bruce Staples, granddaughter of Thomas Overton Moore, Alexandria, Louisiana.

<sup>6</sup> Robert C. Hynson to T. O. Moore, January 3, 1865 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>7</sup> C. T. Mitchell to T. O. Moore, January 14, 1865, *ibid.*

purchased any land in Houston County. However, the ex-governor paid state and county taxes to the amount of \$12.45 for the year 1866, which may have been the tax upon the slaves carried by him to Texas.<sup>8</sup> The first winter spent in his new home was a trying one for him. He suffered ill health and was often unable to supervise the labor of his slaves. Food and other supplies seem to have been scanty, and on one occasion he bartered sugar brought from Louisiana for pork and corn.<sup>9</sup> With the coming of another crop season he made no attempt to cultivate the land upon which he resided. Supplies and other necessities were sent to him by friends in Louisiana, but even these were often detained or confiscated by the enemy or by the Confederate military authorities.<sup>10</sup>

During the ex-governor's absence from Rapides Parish, Thomas C. Manning managed his plantations there. The crops for the year 1864 were very insignificant. On "Mooreland" and "Emfield" only five hogsheads of sugar and seven and a half barrels of molasses were produced in that season. The Agricultural Tax of 1864 on only the amount of land under cultivation amounted to \$1,800.<sup>11</sup> In January, 1864, he had paid a Tithe Tax of \$4,823 to the authorities in Alexandria.<sup>12</sup> Nothing is known of the fortunes of the year 1865 at "Mooreland" and "Emfield", but it may be presumed that the situation improved very little if any. In the spring of 1866 a flood on the Red River was most destructive to the crops. Not a blade of grass was left on some plantations in Rapides Parish.<sup>13</sup> While the flood was at its height, Mrs. Moore and the children were at Crockett, Texas; however, they returned to Louisiana in the fall of the same year.<sup>14</sup> In order to prevent the estate from falling into the hands of the Federal authorities, Mrs. Moore obtained a mortgage on the two plantations as security for \$13,000 which she had loaned to her husband, and as "he now is in exile from the state prays that judgment be rendered on the same."<sup>15</sup>

Having resided in Texas for over a year under the constant fear of being apprehended and arrested by the Federal authori-

<sup>8</sup> Tax Receipt, signed by C. W. Brackin, July 4, 1866, *ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> D. F. Meyers to T. O. Moore, January 20, 1865, *ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> Governor Henry W. Allen to T. O. Moore, March 15, 1865, *ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> Thomas C. Manning to T. O. Moore, December 24, 1864, *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Tax Receipt, January 3, 1864, *ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> B. Egan to T. O. Moore, June 25, 1866, *ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Letter from Opelousas signed "La" to Emma, August 5, 1866, *ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Petition dated September 21, 1865, in possession of Mrs. Shirley Bruce Staples, Alexandria, Louisiana.

ties, Moore decided that the surest way to avoid this threatened ordeal was to move into territory not under the jurisdiction of the United States. Accordingly, he freed his remaining slaves and started the journey to Mexico. There the ex-governor hoped to be safe from any further persecution. There was already in Mexico a group of his close friends who like himself had been leaders in the "lost cause" and on whose heads had been placed a reward if captured. The party of which he was a member was composed of Ex-Governor Henry Watkins Allen and Generals Magruder and Sterling Price, late commanders in the Confederate armies. The journey was made by way of San Antonio, thence to Eagle Pass, Texas, and into Mexico. Upon reaching Mexican soil the party split into two groups, one of which was composed of Ex-Governors Allen and Moore. The entire journey was made on horseback, broken occasionally by a ride in Allen's ambulance which he had managed to carry with him from Shreveport. When night fell, the party halted and made camp. Members of the group took turns at standing guard to prevent their horses being stolen, or worse, their own capture by the enemy. After crossing the Rio Grande at Eagle Pass, Texas, the party decided to proceed to Mexico City. Enroute to the Mexican capital they passed through Monterrey, Saltillo, and San Luis Potosi, and thence to Mexico City. After spending a short time there with his old friends in exile, Moore sailed with some other gentlemen for Havana, Cuba.<sup>16</sup>

In the meantime a number of Moore's close friends and former political advisers back home were seeking a presidential pardon for him. Foremost among these was Richard Taylor, son of Ex-President Zachary Taylor and a general in the Confederate Army during the war. Taylor felt that by his influence with certain high officials in Washington he could secure a pardon for Moore. This act of clemency was made the more difficult due to the fact that Moore was then on foreign soil. Taylor wrote him at Havana and explained the policy adopted by President Andrew Johnson. Said Taylor, "No assurance against arrest will be given in the case of parties absent from the country." He went on to explain that persons interested in a pardon must rely upon their record. Taylor thought that the chances of a pardon would be better after Congress met in December, 1865, especially if the Congressmen from the South were seated.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Sarah A. Dorsey, *Recollections of Henry Watkins Allen* (New York, 1866), 325-326, 329.

<sup>17</sup> R. Taylor to Thomas O. Moore, October 31, 1865 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).



Much to the surprise of Moore and his friends was the active part which J. Madison Wells, Governor of Louisiana in the early days of Reconstruction, took in securing the pardon. Governor Wells wrote President Johnson, requesting that he act favorably upon this matter. In his letter to the President, Governor Wells stated that he had been a neighbor of Moore for forty years and that, although they had always differed in politics, he could vouch for the sterling integrity and the honorable conduct which Moore had on all occasions exhibited. Governor Wells also stated that if the ex-governor were permitted to return to his country and his civil and political rights restored, there would nowhere be found a man who would be more obedient to the laws and the legally constituted authorities.<sup>18</sup>

It was in Havana, Cuba, on September 12, 1865, that Thomas Overton Moore took the oath of allegiance to the United States, promising to

... faithfully support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America and the Union of the States thereunder, and that I will in like manner abide by and faithfully support all laws and proclamations which have been made during the existing rebellion with reference to the emancipation of slaves.<sup>19</sup>

On November 18, 1865, President Johnson issued to Moore a parole which permitted him to live in Louisiana and to travel wherever his business might require, with the understanding that he had taken an oath of allegiance to the United States and would conduct himself as a loyal citizen thereof. On January 15, 1866, almost five years to the day after his state had seceded from the Union, Moore was granted a full pardon by President Johnson.<sup>20</sup>

Upon his return to Rapides Parish the ex-governor found his plantations, which had once been models of beauty and productiveness, reduced to a waste of wilderness, and his splendid mansion a heap of ruins. However, his losses were a necessary consequence of his devotion to a lost cause, and he was not the man to repine over such misfortunes. Because of a shortage of labor, farm supplies, and money, he offered to rent "Emfield". He stated that there were no building on the plantation, and that the lessee or renter might pay the rent by constructing suitable houses on the property.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>18</sup> G. P. Whittington (ed.), "Papers of Thomas Overton Moore, Governor of Louisiana, 1860-1864," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XIII (1930), 11-22.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 18-19.

<sup>21</sup> *Alexandria Louisiana Democrat*, February 27, 1867.

Before the ex-governor could resume his plantation activities, it was necessary for him to arrange for sufficient funds to purchase the necessities of life. Interest rates on money which might be borrowed were unreasonably high. However, through A. R. Miltenberger, a New Orleans commission merchant and broker and an old friend of his, the ex-governor managed to secure a loan of \$6,000. The loan was secured by the pledge of one hundred shares of the stock of the Southern Bank of New Orleans, which Moore had purchased prior to the war.<sup>22</sup> With a part of this money, Moore rebuilt the sugar mill on "Mooreland" which had been destroyed by the enemy raids there in the first Red River campaign of 1863.

With resumption of his life as a planter, Moore engaged in diversified farming, hoping thereby to produce all the food crops necessary to sustain his family and the farm animals; however, his principal crops were sugar cane and cotton. His efforts were not entirely without success, as he sold in one year forty-seven bales of cotton and 431 barrels of molasses.<sup>23</sup>

Many of the former slaves who had been emancipated came back to "Mooreland" and begged for an opportunity to resume their former status. Some of them were permitted to move back into the cabins formerly occupied by them and to work on the plantation for wages. All who came, whether employed or not, were given lodging and food as long as they cared to remain on the premises.<sup>24</sup>

In June, 1869, Moore inserted in the local newspaper an advertisement offering to sell his plantation. He described it as being located eight miles below Alexandria, containing approximately nine hundred acres, five hundred of which were cleared. At this time twelve acres were planted in cane and ninety in corn, which he offered to sell with the plantation if desired. As for buildings on the plantation, there were the hospital, the overseer's house, and four other frame houses. In addition to these, there was a commodious horse and ox stable, a large two-story brick storeroom, and a brick meathouse. The plantation was amply supplied with cisterns, there being five in all with a capacity of ninety thousand gallons. He offered to sell "Moore-

<sup>22</sup> A. R. Miltenberger to T. O. Moore, February 7, 1868 (Moore Collection, Archives, Louisiana State University).

<sup>23</sup> Bills of Sale, *ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> Interview with "Uncle Ike," a former slave of Moore. In 1939 he was living in Alexandria, and was, he said, ninety-four years of age.

land" immediately or at the end of the year.<sup>25</sup> However, the plantation was not sold during the lifetime of Moore.

After his return to Rapides Parish, Ex-Governor Moore was destined to resume his former place as a leader of the Democratic party. In September, 1868, at the meeting of the Democratic party of the parish, he presided as chairman.<sup>26</sup> Six years later he was elected vice-president of the Rapides Parish Democratic Convention, and was one of the delegates elected to represent his parish in the State Democratic Convention at Baton Rouge.<sup>27</sup> Commenting on the State Convention to be held in Baton Rouge, one editor wrote:

Rapides . . . has enthusiastically adopted the White Man's Party for this campaign and our delegates go as its Representatives, and will be received as such. With the list headed by such names as Ex-Governor T. O. Moore, an aged and venerable Democrat, . . . there is no doubt of their being representatives of the combined opposition to Radicalism in the Old Parish of Rapides.<sup>28</sup>

This State Democratic Convention of 1874 was to be the last one that Thomas Overton Moore had the privilege of attending. Not many months after his return from Baton Rouge, he was stricken with an attack of rheumatism from which he was never to recover. His death occurred on Saturday morning, June 25, 1876, at the "Emfield" plantation.<sup>29</sup>

During his lifetime Thomas Overton Moore filled ably and honorably all the public offices entrusted to him. For over a quarter of a century he held positions of high trust and responsibility, and to the best of his ability and judgment he discharged the duties with credit to himself. Full of energy and possessed of a strong will, he was a man who made steadfast friends and bitter enemies. From early manhood he was a disciple of the Jeffersonian theory of Democracy, and never during his long political career did he change his party affiliation. It was his destiny to lead the people of Louisiana through most of the four years of the Civil War, and afterwards to share with them the bitter years of Reconstruction. He lived to see the beginning of a new era for the South, one in which the states of the nation would be again bound together in a common cause, and the bitterness of the Civil War largely erased from their memories.

<sup>25</sup> *Alexandria Louisiana Democrat*, June 30, 1869, in private library of Mrs. Herman Duncan, Alexandria, Louisiana.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, September 23, 1868.

<sup>27</sup> *Alexandria Caucasian*, August 15, 1874.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, August 22, 1874.

<sup>29</sup> *Alexandria Louisiana Democrat*, June 28, 1876.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES

*Federal Government Publications*

*War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies.* 129 vols. (Washington, 1880-1901).

*State Government Publications*

*Louisiana House Journals*, 1848-1853.

*Louisiana Senate Journals*, 1852-1861.

*Louisiana Acts*, 1852-1864.

*Louisiana Documents*, 1848-1861.

*Journal of the Convention to Form a New Constitution for the State of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1852).

*Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1861* (New Orleans, 1861).

*Unpublished Sources*

Genealogy of Moore Family, in possession of Mrs. Shirley Bruce Staples, granddaughter of Thomas Overton Moore, Alexandria, Louisiana.

Land Sale Records and Other Papers, also in possession of Mrs. Shirley Bruce Staples, Alexandria, Louisiana.

Moore, Thomas Overton, Collection (Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge).

*Interviews*

Mrs. Shirley Bruce Staples, Alexandria, Louisiana.

"Uncle Ike," a former slave of Thomas Overton Moore. In 1939 he was living in Alexandria, Louisiana, and was, he said, ninety-four years of age.

*Letters*

Bassett, John S. (ed.), *Correspondence of Andrew Jackson*. 6 vols. (Washington, 1926-1933).

*Newspapers*

Alexandria, Louisiana, *Alexandria American*, 1858-1859 (found in the private library of Mrs. Herman Duncan, Alexandria, Louisiana).

Alexandria, Louisiana, *Caucasian*, 1874.

Alexandria, Louisiana, *Constitutional*, 1860 (found in the private library of Mrs. Herman Duncan, Alexandria, Louisiana).

Alexandria, *Louisiana Democrat*, 1859-1869.

Alexandria, Louisiana, *Red River Republican*, 1852 (found in the private library of Mrs. Herman Duncan, Alexandria, Louisiana).

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, *Advocate*, 1848-1862.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, *Daily Gazette and Comet*, 1856-1861.

Baton Rouge, Louisiana, *Gazette and Comet*, 1853-1856.

Mexico City, Mexico, *Mexican Times*, 1865.

New Orleans *Daily Crescent*, 1856-1862.

New Orleans *Daily Delta*, 1857-1861.

New Orleans *Daily True Delta*, 1858-1861.

New Orleans *Daily Picayune*, 1860-1876.

New Orleans *Times*, 1863-1876.

New Orleans *Weekly Delta*, 1858-1862.

Opelousas, Louisiana, *Opelousas Courier*, 1860.

West Baton Rouge, Louisiana, *Sugar Planter*, 1860.

Shreveport, Louisiana, *Semi-Weekly Shreveport Times*, 1863-1865.

#### SECONDARY SOURCES

##### *General American Histories*

McMaster, John B., *History of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War*. 8 vols. (New York, 1893-1913).

Rhodes, James Ford, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the End of the Roosevelt Administration*. 9 vols. (New York, 1928).

##### *Military Histories*

Booth, Andrew B. (compiler), *Records of Louisiana Confederate Soldiers and Louisiana Confederate Commands*. 3 vols. (New Orleans, 1920).

Duyckinck, Evert A., *National History of the War for the Union, Civil, Military, and Naval*. 3 vols. (New York, n. d.)

Eggleston, George C., *The History of the Confederate War* (New York, 1910).

Evans, Clement A. (ed.), *Confederate Military History*. 12 vols. (Atlanta, 1899).

Johnson, Rossiter, *History of the War of Secession, 1861-1865* (New York, 1910).

Philippe, Louis, *History of the Civil War in America*. 4 vols. (Philadelphia, 1875-1888).

Porter, David D., *The Naval History of the Civil War*. 4 vols. (New York, 1886).

*State Histories*

- Chambers, Henry E., *A History of Louisiana: Wilderness, Province, Territory, State, People*. 3 vols. (New York, 1925).
- Fortier, Alcée, *History of Louisiana*. 4 vols. (New York, 1904).
- Gayarré, Charles, *History of Louisiana*. 4 vols. (New Orleans, 1903).
- Martin, Francois Xavier, *The History of Louisiana*. 2 vols. (New Orleans, 1827-1828).
- Thompson, Maurice, *The Story of Louisiana* (Boston, 1888).

*Regional Histories*

- South in the Building of the Nation*. 13 vols. (Richmond, 1909-1913).

*Monographs*

- Bragg, Jefferson Davis, *Louisiana in the Confederacy* (Baton Rouge, 1941).
- Ettinger, Amos A., *The Mission to Spain of Pierre Soulé, 1853-1855* (New Haven, 1932).
- Fay, Edwin Whitfield, *The History of Education in Louisiana* (Washington, D. C., 1898).
- Fleming, Walter L., *Louisiana State University, 1860-1896* (Baton Rouge, 1936).
- Ficklen, John Rose, *History of Reconstruction in Louisiana (through 1868)* (Baltimore, 1910).
- Lonn, Ella, *Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868* (New York, 1918).
- Lonn, Ella, *Salt as a Factor in the Confederacy* (New York, 1933).

*Articles*

- Davis, Jackson Beauregard, "The Life of Richard Taylor," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917-), XXIV (1942), 49-127.
- Dorris, J. T., "Pardon Seekers and Brokers: A Sequel of Appomattox," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), I (1935), 276-292.
- Greer, James K., "Louisiana Politics, 1845-1861," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XII (1929), 381-416, 550-610; XIII (1930), 67-116, 257-280, 443-483, 617-654.
- Kendall, Lane C., "The Interregnum in Louisiana in 1861," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XVI (1933), 175-208, 375-408, 638-669; XVII (1934), 124-138, 339-348, 524-536.



- Landers, H. L., "Wet Sand and Cotton: Banks' Red River Campaign in Louisiana," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XIX (1936), 150-195.
- Whittington, G. P., "History of Rapides Parish," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XV (1932), 568-580; XVI (1933), 27-37, 235-255, 427-440, 628-638; XVII (1934), 112-138, 327-338, 537-555, 735-750; XVIII (1935), 5-39.
- Whittington, G. P., "Thomas Overton Moore, Governor of Louisiana, 1860-1864," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XIII (1930), 5-10.
- Whittington, G. P. (ed.), "Papers of Thomas Overton Moore, Governor of Louisiana, 1860-1864," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XIII (1930), 11-22.
- Autobiographies, Biographies, Memoirs, and Reminiscences*
- Bassett, John S., *The Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1925).
- Dorsey, Sarah A., *Recollections of Henry Watkins Allen* (New York, 1866).
- Fleming, Walter L., *General W. T. Sherman as a College President* (Cleveland, 1912).
- Fortier, Alcée (ed.), *Louisiana: Comprising Sketches of Parishes, Towns, Events, Institutions, and Persons, Arranged in Cyclopedic Form*. 3 vols. (Atlanta, 1914).
- James, Marquis, *Life of Andrew Jackson* (New York, 1937).
- Johnson, Allen, and Malone, Dumas, (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*. 20 vols. (New York, 1928-1936).
- Marshall, Jessie A. (ed.), *Private and Official Correspondence of General Benjamin F. Butler, during the Period of the Civil War*. 5 vols. (Norwood, Mass., 1917).
- Meynier, A., Jr. (ed.), *Meynier's Louisiana Biographies*. 4 parts. (New Orleans, 1882). Copy in Howard-Tilton Memorial Library of Tulane University, New Orleans.
- The National Cyclopedia of American Biography*. 29 vols. (New York, 1898-1941).
- Parton, James, *General Butler in New Orleans: History of the Administration of the Department of the Gulf in the Year 1862* (New York, 1864).
- Rowland, Dunbar (ed.), *Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist: His Letters, Papers, and Speeches*. 10 vols. (Jackson, Miss., 1923).
- Sherman, William T., *Memoirs of General William T. Sherman* (New York, 1887).

Soniat, Mrs. Eugene, *Biographical Sketches of Louisiana Governors, from Iberville to Foster* (Baton Rouge, 1893).

Sears, Louis Martin, *John Slidell* (Durham, N. C., 1925).

Taylor, Richard, *Destruction and Reconstruction: Personal Experiences of the Late War* (New York, 1879).

*Magazines and Periodicals*

Champomier, P. A., *Statement of the Sugar Crop Made in Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1851, 1852, 1857, 1859, 1860, 1861).

DeBow J. D. B. (ed.), *The Commercial Review of the South and West, a Monthly Journal of Trade, Commerce, Polity, Agriculture, Manufacturing, Internal Improvements, and General Literature* (New Orleans, 1846-1880). Title and places of publication vary.

*Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-).

*Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917-).

*Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1914-).

*Southern Historical Society Papers* (Richmond, 1876-1909).

## THE LOUISIANA PEOPLE'S PARTY\*

By LUCIA ELIZABETH DANIEL

### CHAPTER I

#### ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN POST-BELLUM SOUTH AND LOUISIANA

Impoverished and devastated land; Small landed proprietors; Tenant farmers; Crop liens; One-crop system vs. diversified agriculture; Radical Reconstruction; Constitution of 1879; Agrarian movement begins.

The Civil War virtually reduced the South to the frontier stage of development. Before she could emerge from the chaos and destruction of the War, she was confronted with the deeper confusion of reconstruction dictated by intolerant radicals in Congress.

The South had neither money nor credit with which to replace the losses imposed upon her "by the destruction of war and the mad extravagances of the reconstruction governments."<sup>1</sup> Worthless Confederate currency, inadequate and inaccessible bank capital, and lack of security made the condition of the farmer after the Civil War a pitiable one. To the problems of ruined and impoverished land, damaged credit, dearth of live stock and farm machinery, and lack of seed, must be added the problem of a demoralized labor supply. Railroads were torn up and transportation was crippled. Lands were devastated. Homes, barns, public buildings, and factories were severely damaged or in ruins. Governments were unstable. All of these problems made the plight of the farmer deplorable.

Faced with almost insurmountable obstacles, some farmers discontinued cultivation of their land. According to the census of 1890, the state of Louisiana then had fewer acres of land in farms than in 1860. Throughout the South there was a noticeable decrease in both the size of farms and the number of farms cultivated by the owners; on the other hand, one noted an increase in the number of farms as well as in the number of farms culti-

\* Master's Thesis in History, Louisiana State University, 1942.

<sup>1</sup> Hallie M. Farmer, "The Economic Background of Southern Populism," in *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, 1902- ), XXIX (1930), 77.



vated by cash and share tenants. Lack of interest in the proper care of the soil caused its productivity to decline steadily.<sup>2</sup> The value of farm land in Louisiana between 1860 and 1890 decreased over \$137,000,000.<sup>3</sup>

After the Civil War, cotton culture had been boosted by high prices which English spinners were willing to pay. Exclusive production of this one crop caused a decline in price about 1875. By 1894 cotton was selling for 5¾ cents a pound.<sup>4</sup> Commensurate with this, the cost of production increased due largely to the necessary use of artificial fertilizers. Much of the farmer's so-called profits were expended in this way; while the less fortunate farmers sank deeper and deeper into debt.<sup>5</sup> No longer was land ownership a special privilege of the select few. The small farmer had now become the outstanding type of agriculturist in both the West and the South.<sup>6</sup>

Out of the experience of the Reconstruction years, there developed a system of tenantry, known as the "share system" or the "cropping system." The Negro seemed to work more effectively as a cropper than as a wage laborer. The cotton industry got on its feet again largely through the appearance of this system and of a class of small landed proprietors.<sup>7</sup> To complicate matters, the post-war farmers were almost all victims of poverty with no prospect of accumulating a sufficient reserve to last from one season to the next. Their only salvation was to borrow frequently from one source or another.<sup>8</sup>

The western farmer could generally obtain "advances" from the loan companies or banks, while the southern farmer found "local" money for investment very scarce; the impoverished South did not furnish the security and profits that outside investors desired. Marchants and planters were able to secure loans, but the small farmer was less fortunate. For approximately thirty years after the War, the southern banking system was inadequate to handle the "total credit load of the South."<sup>9</sup>

Credit was extended to the farmer by the merchant who did not lend money but advanced goods in return for a lien upon

<sup>2</sup> Farmer, "The Economic Background of Southern Populism," *loc. cit.*, XXIX, 78-79.

<sup>3</sup> *Report of Statistics of Agriculture in the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890* (Washington, 1895), 100.

<sup>4</sup> *Yearbook of United States Department of Agriculture*, 1895, p. 539.

<sup>5</sup> M. B. Hammond, *The Cotton Industry* (New York, 1901), 136.

<sup>6</sup> John D. Hicks, *The Populist Revolt* (Minneapolis, 1931), 37.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 38-39.

<sup>8</sup> Hammond, *op. cit.*, 128, 130-131.

<sup>9</sup> Hicks, *op. cit.*, 39-40.

the growing crop. The crop lien system that was legalized after the Civil War appeared to be a great blessing to the poverty-stricken South. Eventually, the system was expanded to cover the accounts of farmers with proprietors of country stores as well as those of tenants with their landlords. Credit was necessary regardless of the cost.<sup>10</sup>

A system of peonage sprang up in the cotton South as a result of the crop liens. The farmer was subservient to the will of the merchant, his creditor. There are varying estimates, but it is probable that from three-fourths to nine-tenths of the southern farmers were entangled to a greater or less degree in the system of crop liens.<sup>11</sup>

Accurate and reliable statistics are lacking, but the credit purchaser became clearly a victim of high-priced credit accounts in which prices varied from twenty to fifty percent over cash prices.<sup>12</sup> The debtor farmer planted cotton as the merchant, his creditor, desired. He, then, bought from the store the other items necessary for himself, his family, and his livestock. For fear he might lose his profitable credit business, the merchant opposed arguments favoring crop diversification.<sup>13</sup>

Thus, the problem facing the South was to secure credit in small quantities for a farmer who had very little to offer as security. There were three sources of credit open to the farmer: first, by sharing his crop with the lender; second, by giving a mortgage or lien upon his growing crop; third, by giving a mortgage upon the land which he owned. The second policy became that most frequently used. Interest rates on these mortgages were high—varying according to Grady<sup>14</sup> from thirty to seventy percent. A business man's ability to carry his investment to a successful conclusion is determined not so much by his own ability or integrity, as by such uncontrollable elements as rain, wind, hail, and frost. The farmer accordingly must pay a higher rate of interest due to the degree of risk taken by his creditor.<sup>15</sup>

The one-crop system did not originate with the post-war merchants, but with the planters before the Civil War. Failure to participate in diversified agriculture has been attributed by

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 40-41.

<sup>11</sup> Hammond, *op. cit.*, 149, 155.

<sup>12</sup> Hicks, *op. cit.*, 44.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 45-46.

<sup>14</sup> Henry W. Grady, "Cotton and Its Kingdom," in Joel Chandler Harris, *Life of Henry W. Grady* (New York, 1890), 262-284.

<sup>15</sup> Farmer, "The Economic Background of Southern Populism," *loc. cit.*, XXIX, 82-88.

some to the ignorance of the southern farmer, by others to the freedman's knowledge of cotton cultivation. Cotton culture satisfied the gregarious instincts of the Negro. Whatever the cause may have been, the fact remains that the South through its one-crop system became impoverished while other sections were enriched.<sup>16</sup> Of course, there were other crops produced in the South, such as: corn, tobacco, wheat, oats, and rye. The typical southern farmer continued to raise cotton although he knew the financial condition of those farmers who grew foodstuffs was generally better.<sup>17</sup> The farmer has probably been unduly criticized for his failure to break with the one-crop system. The merchant, his creditor, specified cotton production, as there was generally a ready market for it; if not, the staple could easily be stored and its value did not greatly depreciate.<sup>18</sup>

Loans granted on crops caused the selling price of land to decrease, while the rental value increased. According to statistics compiled when the census of 1880 was taken, the rental value of land in the South equaled in many instances as much as fifty percent of its selling price.<sup>19</sup> Even in Louisiana, according to the census of 1880, eighty percent of the farmers were laboring under the burden of crop mortgages.<sup>20</sup>

Following the presidential terms of Lincoln and Johnson, "Reconstruction in Louisiana developed into one of the most violent struggles in the South."<sup>21</sup> She reorganized her government in accordance with the ten percent plan suggested in Lincoln's proclamation of 1863.<sup>22</sup> Under the administration of General N. P. Banks, who was in control of the federal military district at the time, a constitutional convention was called for 1864. The Constitutional Convention of 1852 had apportioned representation in the house of representatives on the basis of "the total population."<sup>23</sup> This permitted the large planters of Louisiana, who owned most of the Negroes, to secure representation in excess of that to which their voting strength entitled them. Representation in this Convention of 1864 was based on white

<sup>16</sup> *Proceedings Alabama Agricultural Society*, 1888, p. 38, as cited in Farmer, "The Economic Background of Southern Populism," *loc. cit.*, XXIX, 81-82.

<sup>17</sup> Hicks, *op. cit.*, 48-49.

<sup>18</sup> Farmer, "Economic Background of Southern Populism," *loc. cit.*, XXIX, 86.

<sup>19</sup> United States Census Bureau, *Tenth Census, 1880, Agriculture*, II, Part II, pp. 60 ff.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 63.

<sup>21</sup> George M. Reynolds, *Machine Politics in New Orleans, 1897-1926* (New York, 1936), 15.

<sup>22</sup> William McDonald, *Documentary Source Book of American History* (New York, 1929), 470-472.

<sup>23</sup> Article 8 as found in Francis N. Thorpe, *Federal and State Constitutions . . . and Other Organic Laws of . . . the United States . . .* 7 vols. (Washington, 1909), III, 1412.



population only. The planter group in the convention favored Negro suffrage as they saw in it an opportunity for the planters to control the Negro. The Constitution of 1864 as finally approved granted the franchise to white males only; the problem of Negro suffrage was left to the legislature.<sup>24</sup> The Constitution was adopted by a popular vote of 6,836 to 1,566.<sup>25</sup> Louisiana was not admitted to the Union under the Constitution of 1864.

When the Convention of 1864 adjourned, it did so subject to the call of the president. In 1866 many radical Republicans in the state attempted to reconvene it for the purpose of granting the franchise to the Negro. When the convention assembled in New Orleans, a riot with loss of life resulted. There was no additional effort made to continue the convention, but there is no doubt that this unfortunate incident hastened the radical congressional program of reconstruction which was imposed on Louisiana in the Constitution of 1868.<sup>26</sup> Under Article 99, these radical Republicans sought to disfranchise many Democrats of the Confederacy by compelling a very distasteful loyalty oath before they were again permitted to vote or hold office. Through these provisions, the Republican party secured complete control of both state and local governments.<sup>27</sup> Henry C. Warmoth was elected governor.

"As the Republican rule, supported by Negro votes became more radical, corrupt and ruthless, the whites united in the Democratic party to overthrow it."<sup>28</sup> Louisiana had well-founded reasons for opposing Negro suffrage. Until 1890, the Negro population exceeded the white; in addition, the Republican party had won most of these Negroes to its standard.<sup>29</sup>

Active revolt against the Republican party had begun by 1874 when the State Returning Board gave the Republicans a majority of the legislators chosen. Two years later, the Democrats were still continuing their struggle for supremacy. Although both sides claimed the victory in Louisiana, the Republican Returning Board declared a Republican victory by 1,000 votes. As a result, two state governments were set up in New

<sup>24</sup> Articles 14 and 15, as given in Thorpe, *Federal and State Constitutions . . .*, III, 1433.

<sup>25</sup> Reynolds, *Machine Politics in New Orleans, 1897-1926*, 17; see further Ficklen, *Reconstruction in Louisiana through 1868*, 81.

<sup>26</sup> Ficklen, *Reconstruction in Louisiana through 1868*, 170-179.

<sup>27</sup> Thorpe, *op. cit.*, III, 1462.

<sup>28</sup> Lewinson, *Race, Class, and Party* (New York, 1933), 15, as given in Reynolds, *Machine Politics in New Orleans, 1897-1926*, 18.

<sup>29</sup> *The United States Census, 1870-1920, passim*, as cited in Reynolds, *Machine Politics in New Orleans, 1897-1926*, 18.

Orleans and it seemed that civil war was inevitable. The decision in the presidential contest between Hayes and Tilden averted this, however; federal troops were withdrawn and the Republican state government disappeared. Governor Francis T. Nicholls who had been the successful Democratic candidate now assumed his duties as the sole governor of the state.<sup>30</sup> The Democratic party was now faced with the problem of disfranchising the Negro and adjusting "the conflicting interests of the whites." The Federal Constitution and the "fear among the poor, illiterate white men" of losing the vote complicated the disfranchisement of the ignorant, propertyless Negro. "Due to the agrarian unrest and the growth of populism in the Eighties and Nineties, two decades were to elapse before any definite compromise between these conflicting groups could be noted." This schism in the "white solidarity" brought the Negro back into politics. "The use made of his vote was to affect the result of the struggle between the white elements for control of the government."<sup>31</sup>

The Constitution of 1879 and succeeding election laws granted the suffrage to men of foreign birth, if they had been naturalized or had legally declared their intention of becoming United States citizens.<sup>32</sup> It further limited the legislative powers, and stated that the General Assembly should not have the power to contract a debt or issue bonds for the state except to repel invasion or repress insurrection.<sup>33</sup> All lottery charters and privileges were to "cease and expire on the first of January, 1895."<sup>34</sup>

The post-war South was not entirely agricultural. Although the northern capitalist hesitated to finance the southern farmer, he was aware of the possibilities of industrial development in the South. Iron and coal regions were exploited, manufacturing was expanded and new railroads were constructed.<sup>35</sup> Tobacco establishments in North Carolina, molasses and sugar refineries in Louisiana, cotton-seed oil and oil-cake manufactories in Texas and Louisiana were evidences of the new southern industrialism. The farmers and their families, seeking freedom from the grasping country storekeeper, were easily persuaded to accept work in mines, mills, and factories, or on railroads. The movement from country to town, which was the tendency of the age, went on in the South with rapidity.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Reynolds, *op. cit.*, 20.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 20.

<sup>32</sup> Article 185, as given in Thorpe, *op. cit.*, III, 1501-1502.

<sup>33</sup> Article 44, Thorpe, *op. cit.*, III, 1478.

<sup>34</sup> Article 167, Thorpe, *op. cit.*, III, 1499.

<sup>35</sup> Hicks, *op. cit.*, 50.

<sup>36</sup> Allan Nevins, *Emergence of Modern America, 1865-1878* (New York, 1928), 359-360.

The post-Reconstruction period found the businessman more favored in the South than the farmer. White supremacy had been restored by the one-party system (Democratic) which was prepared to protect the interests of the businessman while remaining quite blind to the needs of the farmer.<sup>37</sup>

The white farmer's situation was made more acute "by the existence within the lower South of a definite Black Belt, where the Negroes far outnumbered the whites." The old plantation system supported by its abundance of Negroes had existed and prospered in this fertile country. Usually, freed Negroes did not migrate, and landlordism at its worst was to be found in the Black Belt, where the "storekeeper-landowner held his Negro tenants in a bondage extremely like slavery." The Negroes were allowed no political rights. Nominations and elections to office were controlled by the combined strength of landlords and townspeople. In the hill country, where the whites outnumbered the blacks, the white farmers and "white tenants had the numbers necessary to rule logically if they chose." The opposite was found in state politics where the Black Belt politicians won because their delegates to party conventions were chosen not on the basis of actual voters but in proportion to the whole population.<sup>38</sup>

Prior to the Civil War, the hill or white counties had opposed the control of the Black Belt. This old opposition reasserted itself after the worst days of Reconstruction had passed.

The farmer has always played an important role in American history, and with the end of Reconstruction we witness the appearance of a well-organized agrarian movement. This organization worked during its early days to secure regulation of the railroads in the interest of the farmers. Then, through its members in the Greenback Party, the agrarian movement agitated the currency issue. By the 1880's the Farmers' Union and Farmers' Alliance organizations that came into existence gave the farmers a medium through which their grievances could be aired. Out of the latter came the People's Party movement which was in reality the protest of the small farmer against unbearable conditions for which he held his state government dominated by the Democratic party responsible.

<sup>37</sup> Hicks, *op. cit.*, 51-52.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.



Why Louisiana affiliated with this agrarian movement, and how the unrest of the Louisiana farmers was responsible for the organization of a People's Party will furnish material for the succeeding chapters which deal with pertinent phases of this agrarian movement and its effect upon the state.

## CHAPTER II

### CONDITIONS IN LOUISIANA CAUSING AGRARIAN DISCONTENT

Granger Movement; Greenback Party; Louisiana Bureau of Agriculture; Farmers' Union strong in North Louisiana affiliated with National Farmers' Alliance; Grievances, misfortunes, climatic complaints; *Comrade*; People's Party blamed Democrats for plight of farmers.

The wrath of the southern farmer was aimed at four groups—"the middleman, whose debtor he was, the manufacturer, whose prosperity he envied, the government, in which he had too little voice, and the political party, which placed the interests of other groups above those of the farmer."<sup>1</sup>

For years the farmer had listened to fair promises from the white man's party and by 1890, he and his associates precipitated the most direct threat to Democratic control of the Solid South that the party had ever faced.<sup>2</sup>

The South and the West had common grievances against the railroads, the trusts and the middlemen, the money lenders and the banks. These were destined when the opportune time arrived to bring the two sections together in joint political action.<sup>3</sup> Heretofore, the dissatisfied had sought solace in the West where lands were plentiful. Now that there was a growing dearth of cheap lands in the West and the frontier had vanished, "This safety valve was closed." It was then that a well-organized agrarian movement began to appear.<sup>4</sup>

First, came the Granger Movement in the 1870's. This was an organization of farmers founded in 1867-1868 under the leadership of a small group of government clerks in Washington. The order spread in every direction. Its purposes were to secure for its members a fuller home life, more social outlet, and the advantages of cooperative dealing with the business

<sup>1</sup> Farmer, "Economic Background of Southern Populism," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, XXIX, 89.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 91.

<sup>3</sup> Hicks, *Populist Revolt*, 74.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, vii.

world—most of all it did not emphasize either direct or indirect participation in politics. Granges worked to secure railroad regulation beneficial to the farmers. In 1875, forty-four parishes in Louisiana had Granges while thirteen were without. Catahoula parish with eighteen Granges led the list. St. James and Orleans had only one Grange each.<sup>5</sup>

Before long the Grange ran its course, and many members drifted into the newly organized Greenback party which offered a haven of refuge to the inflationist Grangers. The party, basing its existence on the demand for an inflated currency, agitated the currency question so effectively that it became a paramount issue in American politics until the turn of the century.

In the late 1880's there appeared the Farmers' Alliance, an organization which like the Grange hoped to obtain political remedies for the ills of the farmer without actually entering the field of politics as an organization. Through a list of desirable demands, the Alliance helped secure the passage by the legislature of certain reform measures. It, also, succeeded in getting the Democratic party to incorporate in its platform certain farm concessions. The Alliance is remembered largely for its demands and pressure brought to bear on public officials, and *not* for active participation in politics.

Before entering into a detailed discussion of the Farmers' Alliance in Louisiana, there is another agricultural unit worthy of consideration. Upon the suggestion of the Louisiana Bureau of Agriculture there was organized a State Agricultural Society. A letter from Governor S. D. McEnery dated December 2, 1886, had the following to say:

In accordance with resolutions adopted November 3, 1886, by the Farmers Club of East and West Baton Rouge, requesting the Bureau of Agriculture to call a convention of planters and farmers to assemble in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, for the purpose of organizing a State agricultural society, and the said club at a subsequent meeting having suggested the last Wednesday in January, 1887, as a suitable time for holding such a convention; therefore, I as Governor of Louisiana and ex-officio President of Bureau of Agriculture, do hereby request the planters and farmers of Louisiana to meet at the city of Baton Rouge, in the Agricultural Hall of the State University and A. and M. College, at noon, on the said day, January 26, 1887, for the purpose of organizing a State Agricultural Society.

<sup>5</sup> *The Opelousas Courier*, October 16, 1875.

All agricultural organizations, granges, clubs, fairs, societies, sugar planters' associations and branch associations are requested to send delegates, properly accredited to said convention.<sup>6</sup>

The meeting was held, and the Louisiana State Agricultural Society was organized. Mr. Joseph L. Brent was named president of the Society.<sup>7</sup> All local farm organizations were urged to affiliate with the State Agricultural Society: "State Farmers' Unions, Alliances, Granges, are especially requested to send delegates to confer with us in relation to such legislation as may be necessary for the public welfare."<sup>8</sup>

Louisiana had three agricultural experiment stations. These were located at New Orleans, Baton Rouge, and Calhoun. In the spring of 1888 at Calhoun the North Louisiana Agricultural Society was organized. About fifty men from Jackson, Lincoln, Union, and Ouachita parishes attended this organization meeting. Constitution and by-laws, resolutions, and programme committees were appointed.<sup>9</sup> Organization was perfected at a later meeting. The object as stated "... shall be the mutual improvement of its members in all matters pertaining to Agriculture and kindred subjects."<sup>10</sup> Resolutions were adopted expressing gratitude for the Calhoun Experiment Station, urging the Governor to retain the Commissioner of Agriculture, and requesting the legislature to make liberal appropriations for experimental stations.<sup>11</sup>

At a fall meeting the North Louisiana Agricultural Society denounced the bagging trust as another scheme to fleece the farmers. As a remedy for this evil, the Society made two suggestions: namely, that the bales of cotton be made smaller, and that material other than jute be used for covering the cotton.<sup>12</sup> If cotton bagging were used, the increased demand for cotton would not only boost prices, but the \$5,000,000 formerly spent on jute bagging would find its way into the pockets of southern cotton planters.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Ouachita Telegraph*, December 11, 1886.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, October 26, 1889. Mr. Brent served as President until his resignation in October, 1889.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, May 5, 1888.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, July 7, 1888.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, June 9, 1888.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, September 8, 1888; March 30, 1889.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, May 25, 1889.



The Farmers' Union of Louisiana now entered the controversy. A series of significant resolutions was adopted at their meeting in 1888. Following are some points adopted:

... Resolved, that we will not use jute bagging to wrap our present cotton crop . . . that we will use . . . substitutes, even though it should entail a loss upon us. . . .

... Resolved, that we call upon the Farmers' Unions, Wheels and Alliances of the United States to aid and assist us in creating a home market for cotton material for the sacking of grain and other produce. . . .<sup>14</sup>

Discussion concerning the establishment of a cotton yarn and bagging factory in the state began to take place. Monroe desired this factory. Such an enterprise was not to be a Farmers' Union project, but Farmers' Unions in Morehouse, Ouachita, Union, Lincoln, and Jackson parishes pledged stock.<sup>15</sup> Judge A. A. Gunby was the moving spirit;<sup>16</sup> the Board of Directors favored cooperative subscriptions.<sup>17</sup> Proper organization and cooperation would assure the farmer control of his affairs,<sup>18</sup> thus eliminating the middlemen. Yet another indication of the growing cooperative idea was the establishment in West Monroe of a Farmers' Union Cooperative Store. Members of a Farmers' Union in good standing could become stockholders.<sup>19</sup>

Resolutions adopted at the State Agricultural Society meeting in January 1889 indicated the activity of Louisiana farmers. They endorsed a recommendation by Professor C. C. Harris for establishment of an agricultural school at Calhoun, called on United States senators and representatives to advance the United States Commissioner of Agriculture to Cabinet rank, congratulated farmers of North Louisiana upon the progressive experiment station at Calhoun, congratulated farmers of the state upon their rapid organization into local societies for the advancement of agriculture, and requested these societies to send delegates to the next state meeting.<sup>20</sup>

The discussion over a cotton bagging factory continued into 1889. Judge Gunby and followers still wanted a factory at Monroe.<sup>21</sup> Others led by T. J. Guice, state lecturer of the Farmers'

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, September 29, 1888.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, November 3, 1888.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, November 24, 1888.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, December 1, 1888.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, November 24, 1888.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, December 22, 1888.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, January 26, 1889.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, April 20, 1889.

Union, proposed a contract between subunions of the state and the Lane Mills of New Orleans, manufacturers of cotton bagging.<sup>22</sup> The New Orleans Cotton Exchange indorsed the Farmers' Alliance scheme for using cotton bagging.<sup>23</sup> Mr. J. M. Stallings, president of the State Farmers' Union, issued a call for a special state meeting to discuss two topics—the size of bales and use of cotton bagging.<sup>24</sup> Captain T. S. Adams, chairman of a committee of the Farmers' National Alliance relative to locating a bagging factory in Louisiana, was taking bids for the site. Monroe and Alexandria were each hopeful of being selected.<sup>25</sup>

At the North Louisiana Agriculture Society meeting at Calhoun, over two thousand people were present, among them many celebrities. A special train was run; railroad fares and hotel rates were reduced. A gala time was had. The agricultural progress in the state and agricultural education were commended. Special praise was offered for the splendid experiment station at Calhoun.<sup>26</sup> At a later meeting, the possibility of sugar culture in North Louisiana was discussed. The hill country was admirably adapted to the culture of sorghum, but the presence of starch in syrup extracted from sorghum rendered it unprofitable as a basis of sugar manufacture under existing methods. However, the diffusion process would remove this disadvantage by extracting the saccharine matter from the impurities.<sup>27</sup>

The National Farmers' Alliance meeting at Birmingham in 1889 heard a report of the committee on cotton bagging as a permanent covering for cotton bales. It was estimated that this would absorb 125,000 bales of the cotton crop, and insurance on the entire crop would be \$2,000,000 less. Despite the offer of the bagging trust representative present to lay down jute bagging at 12½ cents per yard against 13 cents for cotton bagging, the Convention unanimously adopted the committee's report.<sup>28</sup>

By 1888 the Farmers' Union, though not a separate political party, was reputed to be strong in north Louisiana, and an active participant in politics. Most of the farmers were still Democrats, whose participation in politics was limited to the

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, April 13, 1889.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, May 25, 1889.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, May 4, 1889.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, June 22, 1889.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, April 27, 1889.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, June 1, 1889.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, May 18, 1889.

support of those Democratic candidates for state offices who seemed most favorable to the policies of the organization.<sup>29</sup>

The purpose of this organization was to educate and organize the farmer. By 1888 the movement had grown to considerable strength in the hill sections of north and west Louisiana, which was the region of the small farmer. The movement never gained much headway in the cotton plantation areas of the lowlands, in the sugar-growing districts, or in the cities.<sup>30</sup>

One of the most active local Farmers' Alliance groups in Louisiana was found in De Soto parish located in northwest Louisiana on the Texas line. In 1890 it adopted the following platform:

1. We demand the repeal of the present lien law, as it now exists, and ask our Representatives to enact a law to give us a better labor system.
2. We demand that all public lands, school or otherwise, be offered for sale in small bodies for actual settlers, not exceeding 320 acres to each purchaser, on easy terms.
3. We demand that all lands held for speculative purposes be valued for taxation at such rate as they are offered to cash purchasers.
4. We demand that immediate steps be taken to prevent foreign non-residents from acquiring titles to lands in the United States.
5. We demand that laws be enacted to prevent the dealing in futures in all agricultural products.
6. That all public lands be only sold to actual settlers.
7. That all railroad property be assessed at the nominal value of the stock upon which they seek to declare dividends.
8. We demand the rapid extinguishment of the public debt by operating the mints to their fullest capacity in the coinage of gold and silver, and tendering the same without discrimination to all public creditors.
9. We demand the enactment of a commerce law that will secure the same rates of freight to all persons for the same kind of commodities, according to the distance hauled.
10. We demand that all convicts be confined within the walls of the Penitentiary, and that the contract system be abolished.

<sup>29</sup> Melvin J. White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, V, 4-5. Thomas Scott Adams was state president, J. W. McFarland was secretary, and T. J. Guice was state lecturer of Louisiana Farmers' Alliance. *Biennial Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Louisiana, 1888-1890*, xiii.

<sup>30</sup> George M. Reynolds, *Machine Politics in New Orleans, 1897-1926*, 22.



11. We suggest the propriety of the parishes buying all lands offered at tax sales and that the same be held for actual settlers, in bodies not exceeding 160 acres.<sup>31</sup>

One cannot read the De Soto platform without realizing that the farmers of North Louisiana were taking an active part in state politics, not in opposition to the Democratic party, but merely as interested farmers. They wished to reform what they considered abuses in the law and to relieve the farming classes from the burden and hardships of which they complained.

In December 1889, the National Farmers' Alliance meeting in St. Louis adopted a plan of confederation with the Knights of Labor. Cordial greetings were exchanged with the Single Tax and Greenback parties. In 1890 the first intimation of any independent political action was manifested, when all labor organizations, including the Farmers' Alliance, met in convention in December at Ocala, Florida. They drafted a platform and pledged themselves to support the political party that would enact them into law. The Ocala platform follows:

1. We demand the abolition of national banks, and the substitution of legal tender treasury notes in lieu of national bank notes, issued in sufficient volume to do the business of the country on a cash system, regulating the amount needed on a *per capita* basis as the business interests of the country expand; and that all money issued by the government shall be legal tender in payment of all debts, both public and private.

2. We demand that Congress shall pass such laws as shall eventually prevent the dealing in futures of all agricultural and mechanical productions, preserving a stringent system of procedure in trials, and imposing such penalties as shall secure the most perfect compliance with the law.

3. We demand the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

4. We demand the passage of laws prohibiting the alien ownership of land, and that Congress take early steps to devise some plan to obtain all lands now owned by aliens and foreign syndicates, and that all lands now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of such as are actually used and needed by them be reclaimed by the government and held for actual settlers.

5. Believing in the doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, we demand that taxation, national or state, shall not be used to build up one interest or class

---

<sup>31</sup> *Times-Democrat* (New Orleans), April 18, 1888.

at the expense of another. We believe that the money of the country shall be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people; and hence we demand that all revenues—national, state, or county—shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the government, economically and honestly administered.

6. We demand that Congress issue a sufficient amount of fractional paper currency to facilitate exchange through the medium of the United States mail.<sup>32</sup>

The Alliance was founded upon and bound together by noble principles:

1. To labor for the education of the agricultural classes in the science of economical government in a strictly non-partisan spirit.

2. To indorse the motto, "In things essential, unity; and in all things charity."

3. To develop a better state, mentally, morally, socially, and financially.

4. To create a better understanding for sustaining civil officers in maintaining law and order.

5. To constantly strive to secure entire harmony and good will among all mankind and brotherly love among ourselves.

6. To suppress personal, local, sectional and national prejudice, all unhealthful rivalry and selfish ambition.

7. The brightest jewels which it garners are the tears of widows, and orphans, and its imperative commands are bleeding; to assuage the sufferings of a brother or a sister; bury the dead; care for the widows and educate the orphans; to exercise charity toward offenders; to construe words and deeds in their most favorable light, granting honesty of purpose and good intentions to others, and to protect the principles of the Alliance unto death. Its laws are reason and equity; its cardinal doctrines inspire purity of thought and life; its intentions are peace on earth and good will toward men.<sup>33</sup>

T. J. Bird, Commissioner of Bureau of Agriculture of Louisiana, commended the Farmers' Alliance and its rapid growth. Through unity the farmers were realizing many benefits, and the Bureau encouraged their seeking more advantages in money centers and legislative halls.<sup>34</sup> The Louisiana legislature passed

<sup>32</sup> Thomas H. McKee, *National Conventions and Platforms of All Political Parties, 1789 to 1905* (Baltimore, 1906), 278-279; *World Almanac*, 1891, pp. 93-94.

<sup>33</sup> *Times-Democrat*, September 7, 1896.

<sup>34</sup> *Biennial Report of the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Louisiana*, April, 1890, vi.

an act providing for the incorporation of "... Farmers' Alliances and similar organizations. . . ." <sup>35</sup> All over the United States this popular farm movement was growing the early 1890's. In Louisiana a state organization was completed and a meeting held at Lafayette in 1891. Although a farmers' meeting it virtually became an anti-lottery gathering, for prominent anti-lotteryites took charge and succeeded in getting the group to declare itself hostile to the Louisiana lottery. The National Farmers' Alliance had already voiced its opposition to the lottery. <sup>36</sup> Colored farmers had their alliances. <sup>37</sup>

Among names prominent in the Louisiana Farmers' Alliance were: T. S. Adams, H. L. Brian, T. J. Guice, G. W. Bruce, J. C. Henry, W. O. Bates, Josiah Kleinpeter, J. W. McFarland, Hon. A. Benoit, T. S. Fontenot, and J. A. Tetts. Although records of annual state meetings through 1897 were found, it seems that the sub-alliances were defunct or no longer functioned effectively after 1891, but rather merged with and accomplished much through affiliation with the Populist movement in Louisiana until 1900. Said one newspaper, "The 'bear' that destroyed the Farmers' Alliance and crippled reform was the Anti-Lottery Campaign of 1894." <sup>38</sup> Another newspaper stated:

The greatest and best educator of the farmers was the Alliance, which was founded on the broadest principles of humanity and justice. It was a noble order, and its purposes and platforms pure and lofty. It was a friend of the producing classes and led up to a higher plane of enlightenment. It taught the farmers the benefits of association, and gave them lessons of far-reaching importance. Many a thrifty farmer owes his salvation from debt and penury to the holy teachings of the Alliance. Women and children were benefited as well as the men. It contributed to the social pleasures and broke the monotony of farm life. . . . <sup>39</sup>

The grievances of the farmers were many. They complained of a fertilizer trust, a jute-bagging trust, and a cottonseed oil trust. The crop lien system was still a problem. Real and personal property was pledged for debt, taxes were heavy and the farmer was convinced that he was the helpless victim of unreasonable and discriminatory legislation. These were the ad-

<sup>35</sup> *Louisiana Laws*, 1890, p. 42.

<sup>36</sup> *Times-Democrat*, August 5, 1891.

<sup>37</sup> *Winn Parish Democrat* (Winnfield), April 25, 1890.

<sup>38</sup> *Louisiana Populist* (Natchitoches), January 25, 1895.

<sup>39</sup> *Times-Democrat*, September 7, 1896, quoting *Monroe Doctrine*.



ditional complaints of excessive railroad rates, distribution of passes, speculation in farm products, usury, and currency contraction.<sup>40</sup>

All of these grievances were matters for legislation. Voters were urged to support candidates pledged to work for abolition of the farmers' evils. Most of the abuses complained of were inaugurated during the Republican regime, but even under a Democratic administration they had not been rectified. Since President Cleveland and Richard Olney, his Attorney-General, had both been formerly railroad attorneys, slight was the chance of the transportation prices being improved.<sup>41</sup> The farmer was getting only 19 cents per bushel for wheat while railroads were charging 14½ cents per bushel for hauling it to market.<sup>42</sup> Railroads had succeeded in getting control of legislatures in many key states. They had even laid their hands upon Congress. The cry heard from farmers was "the government must own the railroads or the railroads will own the government."<sup>43</sup>

The grievances already enumerated combined to make the status of the Louisiana farmer most deplorable. His misfortunes seemed to multiply. He suffered one setback and reverse after another. Climatic conditions made his lot harder.<sup>44</sup> In March 1891 severe frosts retarded the growth of his garden truck and vegetables. Consequently he failed to get into the early northern market with its fancy prices. The year 1892 was one of weather surprises. A cold snap with rain and icicles five or six inches long came in the middle of March and lasted several days. It played havoc with truck farming around New Orleans. Oranges and other tender plants were injured, and flowers were blighted. Beans, lettuce, and squash were killed while beets and turnips were not badly injured. Blossoming fruit trees, vegetables, and strawberries suffered greatest damage.<sup>45</sup> In April rivers attained "flood stage never before reached since observations on those rivers first began." Early crops were destroyed, and after water subsided crops could be planted only in favorable localities. There was doubt whether these replanted crops could pay the producer for his labor. In the highlands the crops were vigorous,

<sup>40</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, September 1, 7, 1894.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, September 9, 1894.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, December 14, 1894.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, March 29, 1895.

<sup>44</sup> The People of the state were visited by a series of natural calamities between 1891 and 1897. These added to the distress and discontent which made conditions favorable for the rise and development of a political movement expected to bring relief.

<sup>45</sup> *Times-Democrat*, March 19, 1892.

and despite rains from June through August, these farmers had promise of fair returns. The rice crop was not damaged, but the yield of cotton and corn was reduced fully one-third its previous estimates.<sup>46</sup> Cotton suffered from weeds, grass, boll worm ("sharp shooters") and caterpillars. The cane crop was unusually fine. Short crops were found in minor products—fruit, melons, pears, plums, grapes, figs, and Irish potatoes. Good yields were expected in sweet potatoes, cow peas, turnips, and oats. Hay and fodder were destroyed by rains. As an experiment, tobacco culture was begun in North Louisiana.<sup>47</sup>

May brought crevasses in the levees, the most serious one being one mile from Bonnet Carré.<sup>48</sup> Another crevasse was found at the Tessier plantation in St. James parish about forty-six miles above New Orleans. It was feared that some of the richest sugar plantations would be inundated and hundreds of people made destitute. Traffic on the Mississippi Valley Railroad was interrupted. The cause of these floods seemed to be the vast increase in the volume of water due to settlement and deforestation of the country above. The only solution for the low country was the levee system.<sup>49</sup> In 1892, Louisiana had 37 crevasses, many of them very small. Practically all of the breaks were attributed to the crawfish. The two most disastrous, Belmont and Sarpy, resulted from crawfish holes. Sarpy was in St. John the Baptist parish, while Belmont was in St. James parish.<sup>50</sup>

The Louisiana Legislature appropriated a "High Water Emergency Fund" of \$30,000 that was to be expended by the governor as necessary to relieve the destitute and repair levees threatened or broken by the high waters of 1892.<sup>51</sup> The loss in Louisiana from the floods of 1892 was given as follows:

Loss on crops .....	\$400,000
Losses on other property .....	100,000
Damage to railroads .....	200,000
Total.....	<u>\$700,000</u>

The estimated damage to the Mississippi Valley area was between \$32,000,000 and \$40,000,000.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>46</sup> *Times-Democrat*, September 1, 1892, quoting United States Department of Agriculture Weather Bureau Report, New Orleans, August 31, 1892.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Times-Democrat*, May 17, 1892.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, May 23, 28, 1892.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, July 25, 1892.

<sup>51</sup> *Louisiana Laws*, 1892, pp. 41-42.

<sup>52</sup> *Times-Democrat*, May 29, 1892.

To cope with these floods the residents of the rich Mississippi delta regions realized they must no longer advocate deepening the river but taxing themselves for levee erection. This would be far cheaper in the end than devastating crevasses. Five levee districts were created: Tensas, Pontchartrain, Orleans, Atchafalaya, and Bayou Boeuf.<sup>53</sup>

Many farmers planted crops in 1892 without expecting to realize on them. They argued that as they must feed and care for the colored laborers and their families on the place if they would prevent them from leaving the state, they might as well give them such employment as could be found for them.<sup>54</sup>

The last of the misfortunes or calamities of this period was the drought of the spring and summer of 1896. This caused an almost total loss of crops in the hill parishes of North Louisiana—Lincoln, Union, Winn, Catahoula, Jackson, Ouachita, Bienville, Webster, Natchitoches, Caldwell, Claiborne, and Grant.<sup>55</sup> Most of the residents at first feared outside aid as labor became so demoralized by expecting free rations. The situation became so critical that a state relief committee headed by Uriah Millsaps began concerted organization for aid to the destitute thousands. Donations of money, clothing, meal, meat, flour, sugar, molasses, flannel cloth, corn, and bacon were distributed among the sufferers.<sup>56</sup> To climax all the suffering, Ouachita, Richland, Tensas, and Madison parishes were visited by a terrible loss of cattle, hogs, and mules from charbon. In many cases, this disease destroyed all the work animals farmers owned.<sup>57</sup>

Two things finally aroused the farmer and sent him forth on that nineteenth century crusade which history knows as the Populist Movement. One of these was the enthusiasm aroused by the various organizations which spread over the country in the eighties and gathered the farmers into articulate groups for the first time in a generation. The other was the growing resentment which the farmer felt as he observed the prosperity which blessed his urban neighbors while he suffered from grinding poverty.<sup>58</sup>

Everywhere Populism was a product of hard times, "the principal cause for which, so far as Louisiana was concerned, was the depression in the cotton industry."<sup>59</sup> Here, just as else-

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, May 30, 1892.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, July 3, 1892.

<sup>55</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, August 28, September 11, 1892.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, November 20, December 4, 25, 1896; *Times-Democrat*, September 15, 25, 29, 1896.

<sup>57</sup> *Times-Democrat*, June 7, 1896.

<sup>58</sup> Farmer, "The Economic Background of Southern Populism," *loc. cit.*, XXIX, 88-89.

<sup>59</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 3.



where in this region, diversification of crops had not been greatly practiced, cash capital was lacking, since the profits of the more prosperous years had been spent in repairing the ruins of war, in restocking farms and plantations, and in clearing and preparing new lands for cultivation.<sup>60</sup>

The People's Party movement in Louisiana must be interpreted in the light of the plight of the small farmer. It voiced his protest against the unfair economic conditions for which he held his state government controlled by the Democratic party to blame.

### CHAPTER III

#### LOUISIANA PEOPLE'S PARTY, 1890-1892

Omaha platform; Congressional campaign of 1890; Louisiana People's Party organized in Fourth congressional district, 1890; Full state ticket, 1892; Anti-lottery campaign, Foster elected governor; Tannehill, Populist nominee, received 9,782 votes; Presidential campaign of 1892.

The approach of the year 1890 found the farmer in a position no more favorable than that which he had occupied fifteen years earlier. In December, 1890, the first intimation of any independent political action was shown when all the labor organizations, including the Farmers' Alliance, met in convention at Ocala, Florida, formulated their principles into demands and pledged themselves to support the political party that would enact them into law. Delegates from the Farmers' Union, Knights of Labor and other similar groups met in national convention at Cincinnati, Ohio, on May 19, 1891. They adopted a platform and selected a name now contracted to People's Party. Although the name Farmers' Alliance continued in use until 1897, its interests were earlier merged with those of the People's Party<sup>1</sup> which pledged itself to work for reforms and proposed legislation with that end in view.<sup>2</sup>

A convention at St. Louis on February 22, 1892, brought the People's Party into prominence as a national organization, and issued a call for another convention to be held at Omaha, Nebraska, July 2, for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice-President.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>60</sup> United States Census Bureau, *Twelfth Census, 1900, Agriculture*, VI, 407.

<sup>1</sup> *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History*, III, 311.

<sup>2</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, September 7, 1894.

<sup>3</sup> *Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History*, III, 311.

In order to know what a party stands for, its platform must be read. The Omaha platform was the best the People's Party ever had. It was a stirring document that dismissed the tariff issue of the two old parties as a "sham battle" and declared that the financial question was the only issue worthy of consideration. This platform, as adopted July 4, 1892, the one hundred sixteenth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, will not be given in full—but certain demands are worthy of mention:

We demand,—

*First*, A national currency, safe, sound, and flexible, issued by the general government only, a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, and that, without the use of banking corporations, a just, equitable, and efficient means of distribution direct to the people, at a tax not to exceed two percent per annum, to be provided as set forth in the sub-treasury plan of the Farmers' Alliance, or a better system; also, by payments in discharge of its obligations for public improvements.

(a) We demand free and unlimited coinage of silver and gold at the present legal ratio of sixteen to one.

(b) We demand that the amount of circulating medium be speedily increased to not less than fifty dollars per capita.

(c) We demand a graduated income tax.

(d) We believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all state and national revenues shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the government economically and honestly administered.

(e) We demand that postal savings banks be established by the government for the safe deposit of the earnings of the people and to facilitate exchange.

*Second*, Transportation. Transportation being a means of exchange and a public necessity, the government should own and operate the railroads in the interest of the people.

(a) The telegraph and telephone, like the post office system being a necessity for the transmission of news, should be owned and operated by the government in the interest of the people.

*Third*, Land. The land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is the heritage of the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes, and alien ownership

should be prohibited. All land now held by railroads and other corporations in excess of their actual needs, and all lands now owned by aliens, should be reclaimed by the government and held for actual settlers only.<sup>4</sup>

A series of resolutions expressive of the opinion of the party were adopted as follows:

1. *Resolved*, That we demand a free ballot and a fair count in all elections, and pledge ourselves to secure it to every loyal voter without federal intervention, through the adoption by the States of the unpurverted Australian or secret ballot system.

2. *Resolved*, That the revenue derived from a graduated income tax should be applied to the reduction of the burden of taxation now resting upon the domestic industries of this country.

3. *Resolved*, That we pledge our support to fair and liberal pensions to ex-Union soldiers and sailors.

4. *Resolved*, That we condemn the fallacy of protecting American labor under the present system, which opens our ports to the pauper and criminal classes of the world, and crowds out our wage-earners; and we denounce the present ineffective laws against contract labor, and demand the further restriction of undesirable immigration.

5. *Resolved*, That we cordially sympathize with the efforts of organized workingmen to shorten the hours of labor, and demand a rigid enforcement of the existing eight-hour law on government work, and ask that a penalty clause be added to the said law.

6. *Resolved*, That we regard the maintenance of a large standing army of mercenaries, known as the Pinkerton system, as a menace to our liberties, and we demand its abolition; and we condemn the recent invasion of the Territory of Wyoming by the hired assassins of plutocracy, assisted by federal officials.

7. *Resolved*, That we commend to the favorable consideration of the people and the reform press the legislative system known as the initiative and referendum.

8. *Resolved*, That we favor a constitutional provision limiting the office of President and Vice-President to one term, and providing for the election of senators of the United States by a direct vote of the people.

9. *Resolved*, That we oppose any subsidy or national aid to any private corporation for any purpose.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Edward Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency from 1788 to 1897* (Boston and New York, 1924), 509-512.

<sup>5</sup> Stanwood, *op. cit.*, 512-513.



In Winn parish during the congressional campaign of 1890, the first steps in the formation of the People's Party in Louisiana were taken. Already the earlier political activities of the farmers of north and northwest Louisiana have been cited. Prior to the nominations, the alliance men of the fourth congressional district, then composed of the parishes of Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, De Soto, Grant, Natchitoches, Rapides, Red River, Sabine, Vernon, Webster, and Winn, were backing a candidate, District Judge William P. Hall of De Soto, who had the support of a majority of the delegates to the district nominating convention.<sup>6</sup> It was charged that through trickery he failed to get the nomination. So greatly enraged did his supporters become that steps were taken to avenge the wrong. The Winn parish delegation bolted the convention, went home, organized, and sent Hardy L. Brian to the leading alliance men in most of the parishes in the district in order to secure delegates to a convention at Natchitoches. When this convention met it nominated T. J. Guice, of De Soto parish, lecturer of the state Farmers' Alliance, as a candidate for Congress to oppose the district convention nominee. In the election, N. C. Blanchard received 8,307 votes while Guice polled 277 votes.<sup>7</sup> Despite the wide margin in votes, the foundation had been laid for the People's Party.

*The Winn Parish Democrat* was the only newspaper in the parish at the time of the campaign in 1890. The Farmers' Alliance men purchased it and began publishing the *Comrade* at Winnfield. "H. L. Brian, a man of energy and unusual ability, was chosen editor. He was the leader of the People's Party in Louisiana, and, besides editing the chief newspapers of the party, served first as secretary and later as chairman of its state central committee."<sup>8</sup>

The People's Party was fully organized by the state campaign of 1892. They had a ticket in the field, and enthusiasm and interest were keen. It is a known fact that this organization was influenced by the Cincinnati convention of 1891, at which H. L. Brian of Winn parish and I. J. Mills of Calcasieu represented

<sup>6</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (1914- ), V. 5-6. Verified in a letter from H. L. Brian, a former Populist, who is now living in Shreveport.

<sup>7</sup> *Report of the Secretary of State to His Excellency W. W. Heard, Governor of the State of Louisiana* (Baton Rouge, 1902), 574; *World Almanac*, 1892, p. 340. White's article quoted results of 1890 congressional election as: 16,442 for Blanchard to 5,167 for Guice. Examination of election figures reveals that Dr. White erroneously quoted figures for 1892 rather than 1890. The results quoted above are accurately stated.

<sup>8</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V. 6.

Louisiana. The aims of the Louisiana People's Party were similar to, if not identical with, those of the national organization. Keenest interest was manifested in securing many purely local reforms. Among those desired for Louisiana was "the reform of the convention system for nominating candidates for state offices." Heretofore, delegates to state conventions had been apportioned among the parishes in proportion to the vote cast in former elections. The "swamp" or "black" parishes in making their appointments counted the Negro vote, "never actually cast," and this made it possible for those parishes to control the "white" or "hill" parishes. There was talk of reforming "the appointive power of the governor" as charges had been made that offices were awarded to "the centers of greatest political influence, the 'black' parishes . . . and that this worked to the detriment of the 'white' or 'hill' parishes." This condition enabled the governor to "perpetuate his authority" by building up a strong machine.<sup>9</sup>

The chief issue before the voters of Louisiana in 1892 was an outgrowth of agitation dating from 1890, calling for renewal of the charter of the Louisiana State Lottery Company, which was scheduled to expire January 1, 1894.<sup>10</sup>

Since Louisiana legislatures are chosen every four years, the one elected in 1892 inherited the task of deciding on the application of the lottery company. The campaign was very exciting, as the result of the election was considered of strategic importance. "The democratic party split into factions, known as the anti-lottery and the regulars with Murphy J. Foster and Samuel D. McEnery as their respective candidates for governor." Disagreements of some nature, "apparently foreign to the great question of the day, had, also, divided the republicans into two groups, each with a candidate for governor."<sup>11</sup>

Two decades later, United States Senator Murphy J. Foster in an address spoke of the evils of the Louisiana Lottery:

The Louisiana State Lottery, one of the monstrous products of the days of reconstruction, was seeking a renewal of its charter by means of a constitutional amendment, and offered \$1,250,000 a year for the privilege of continuing its operations.

Our State was then poor and impoverished. . . . Her levees were weak and broken in many places. . . .

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 6-7.

<sup>10</sup> Alcée Fortier, *History of Louisiana* (New York, 1904), IV, 220-225.

<sup>11</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 7.

Public schools, charitable institutions and old soldiers were in need of relief.

Taking advantage of the needs of an impoverished people, this rich and powerful corporation . . . adroitly apportioned this enormous sum to the public schools, the levees, the charitable institutions, the old Confederate soldiers and the general fund. . . . Many of our good citizens resented this proposition as an insult to the honor of our people and to the good name of our State.<sup>12</sup>

State Senator Foster made the first speech on the floor of the state senate against accepting the lottery offer. The people of Louisiana resolved to follow through the anti-lottery campaign. So acute did the problem become that the Democratic party was divided by fierce and factional strife.

Events happened swiftly. The United States Supreme Court rendered a decision sustaining the Wanamaker anti-lottery postal law. As a result, the revenue amendment, that would have granted Mr. John A. Morris and associates a lottery privilege for twenty-five years in consideration of a license sufficiently high to be of material assistance to the state of Louisiana, was withdrawn.<sup>13</sup> There was considerable speculation among the regular Democrats as to the possibility of the Fosterites withdrawing from the state contest, since their issue had been withdrawn.<sup>14</sup> The supporters of McEnery, the regular Democratic nominee, were hopeful of democratic unity under their banner.<sup>15</sup>

The Farmers' Alliance meeting at Lafayette in August 1891 had nominated Thomas Scott Adams for governor.<sup>16</sup> He received the nomination by acclamation of the "bolters" in session at Baton Rouge. He declined the nomination and Murphy J. Foster of St. Mary parish was then placed at the head of the ticket.<sup>17</sup> There were those who felt Adams made a mistake to decline the "bolters" nomination for governor. It had the appearance of a bargain to "hoodwink" the farmers into believing the Foster faction was in sympathy with them.<sup>18</sup> Adams was put on the "bolters" ticket as a candidate for secretary of state, while Foster remained the nominee of the "bolters" or anti-lottery faction for

<sup>12</sup> *Speech of Honorable Murphy J. Foster, New Orleans, October 3, 1911.* Copy can be found in the Howard Memorial Library, New Orleans.

<sup>13</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 4, 1892; *ibid.*, February 13, 1892, quoting *Washington Post*, February 9, 1892.

<sup>14</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 5, 1892.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, March 11, 1892.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, August 7, 1891.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, January 18, 1892, quoting *Vermilion Star*.

<sup>18</sup> *Times-Democrat*, January 18, 1892, quoting *Robeline News*.



governor. Samuel D. McEnery of Ouachita parish was nominated by the regular Democrats for governor.<sup>19</sup>

The campaign tactics used by each faction were very interesting. Fear was expressed that if Foster were elected, the will of the majority would vanish and bolters hopeful of winning would appear in every election.<sup>20</sup> It was further charged that as a candidate for governor he "was guilty of seeking to bribe with the promise of official positions" from tax collectorships to the superintendency of a new canal in New Orleans.<sup>21</sup> The regular Democrats found themselves confronted with the impression put out by the Fosterites that a vote for McEnery was a vote for the lottery.<sup>22</sup> A proposal was made in February by the State Central Committee that both Democratic tickets be withdrawn and a new ticket presented at a state convention to be held in New Orleans not later than March 15. The Fosterites rejected this proposal, but submitted a counter proposal:

Fosterites name—Governor and Attorney General.

Farmers' Alliance name—Secretary of State and Superintendent of Education.

McEnery faction name—Lt. Governor and State Auditor. This proposal was also rejected.<sup>23</sup>

The People's Party paper in Winnfield, the *Comrade*, had this to say:

With these two factions waging war one with the other in the "father's house," with the probability of the Republican putting out a State ticket, the outlook for the newborn babe in this State, the People's Party, to be ultimately crowned victor in this campaign is quite flattering indeed.<sup>24</sup>

The Louisiana People's Party convened its first meeting February 1, 1892, at Alexandria. Significant and representative whites were present. About twenty-four colored delegates were in attendance. Chief among them was C. A. Roachborough of Iberia, a fluent and ready parliamentarian, who was nominated for state treasurer but withdrew his name. The convention placed a full People's Party ticket in the field:

Governor—R. L. Tannehill of Winn Parish.

Lt. Governor—I. J. Mills of Calcasieu.

<sup>19</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 13, 1892. Verified in letter from Dr. R. B. Paine, a Populist delegate from Vernon parish to the convention. He now lives in Mandeville.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, March 15, 1892, quoting *St. Landry Democrat*.

<sup>21</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 29, 1892.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, January 22, 1892, quoting *Natchitoches Democratic Review*.

<sup>23</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 18, 1892.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, January 4, 1892, quoting *Winnfield Comrade*.

Secretary of State—D. McStravick of Orleans.  
 Treasurer—John Mahoney of Orleans.  
 Auditor—John Hendricks of Caddo.  
 Superintendent of Education—J. D. Patton of Grant.  
 Attorney-General—Judge Wade Hough of Caldwell.<sup>25</sup>

The Party also adopted a platform at this their first convention. They declared their unqualified adherence to the Ocala platform.

Realizing that it is useless to expect from the Republican or Democratic party under their present leaders those measures of legislative reform and relief that are absolutely essential to the welfare and prosperity of the agricultural and industrial classes, and that will prove beneficial to all classes of the community alike, except those few that have brought about the existing financial and commercial system under which the rich grow richer and the poor grow poorer,

We call upon the voters of the state who are suffering by tens of thousands to-day from the effects of unjust legislation to throw off the party shackles that have bound them for so many years, and to reassert their political freedom by voting for men from their own ranks . . . for men whose interests demand the legislative reforms that they advocate.<sup>26</sup>

The opposing Democratic factions in Louisiana "agreed to settle their differences through the means of a white primary." The ticket receiving the highest number of votes was to be declared the ticket of the Democratic party.<sup>27</sup>

Democratic state tickets in the primary election of 1892 were:<sup>28</sup>

Regulars		Anti-Lotteryites
S. D. McEnery	Governor	Murphy J. Foster
Robert C. Wickliffe	Lt. Governor	Charles Parlange
L. F. Mason	Secretary of State	Thomas Scott Adams
O. B. Steele	State Auditor	W. W. Heard
Gabriel Montegut	State Treasurer	John Pickett
E. W. Sutherland	Attorney-General	M. J. Cunningham
Remy Klock	} Superintendent of Education	A. D. La Fargue
J. V. Calhoun		

The primary was held on March 22 and even though the vote was declared to be McEnery 36,342, Foster 34,615, a com-

<sup>25</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 18, 1892.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, February 19, 1892.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, February 21, 1892.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, March 27, 1892.

mittee of seven was designated to recount and examine the returns.<sup>29</sup> This committee of seven rendered the final result of the primary election—McEnery 43,053, Foster 43,602—thus declaring Foster the Democratic nominee by a majority of 549 votes.<sup>30</sup>

The Republican factions at first each presented a nominee for governor. Leonard was said to have quite a strong following in several sections of North Louisiana, particularly in Caddo, where the able colored leader, William Harper, could control the great strength of the Negro vote in that parish.<sup>31</sup>

The campaign conducted by the People's Party was quiet and without ostentation. Tannehill's strength it was thought would come mainly from North Louisiana. He was reported to be gaining followers in the Florida parishes and the sugar districts. It was the belief of Mr. Thomas A. Clayton, Populist campaign manager, that if the state election were not held until May, Tannehill would poll a much larger vote, as daily his following was increasing.<sup>32</sup>

The election held on April 19 ended in a victory for the anti-lottery faction. Their candidate for governor, Foster, had a plurality of over 30,000 votes; R. L. Tannehill, sheriff of Winn parish and treasurer of the State Farmers' Alliance, received 9,782 votes. He carried the parishes of Catahoula, Grant, Vernon, and Winn. "Those figures do not indicate the numerical strength of the party at the time, however, for the State Farmers' Alliance had made a fusion agreement with the anti-lottery Democrats, and this divided their vote."<sup>33</sup>

There can be no better proof that the Farmers' Alliance and agitation of the grievances of the agricultural classes had had an effect on Louisiana politics than the membership of the legislature in 1892. The Louisiana legislature had a larger proportion of farmers than it had ever had previously. Following is the profession or occupation given by each member:

	<i>Senate</i>	<i>House</i>	<i>Total</i>
Farmers and planters.....	22	40	62
Lawyers .....	8	13	21
Merchants .....	2	10	12
Manufacturers .....	1	5	6
Others .....	3	30	33

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, March 28, 1892.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, April 6, 1892.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, February 1, 1892, quoting *Shreveport Times*.

<sup>32</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 16, 1892.

<sup>33</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1894-1896*, 178-179.



Farmers composed nearly 2/3 of the Senate and over 2/5 of the House of Representatives, while lawyers constituted barely 1/7 of the General Assembly.<sup>34</sup> The People's Party elected to the state senate Reverend B. F. Brian, a farmer from Grant parish.<sup>35</sup>

Because of the dissatisfaction with the result of the Democratic primary, cries favoring ballot box reform were heard.<sup>36</sup> The Louisiana legislature which adjourned July 7, 1892, passed some important measures and failed to pass others. It created new levee districts and boards of supervision. Rice flumes were abolished and a \$30,000 appropriation was passed for relief of flood sufferers. Among the things left undone were: revision of election laws, the adoption of some system that would assure an honest election and honest count; revision and reformation of the judiciary system.<sup>37</sup> An act was passed prohibiting the sale or offer of sale of lottery tickets and lottery drawings or schemes in the state of Louisiana after December 21, 1893. Provision was made for prevention and punishment for violations of this act. Corporations as well as individuals were subject to punishment.<sup>38</sup>

It was generally acknowledged that Louisiana had poor election laws. In 1892 the legislature appointed a committee to investigate the situation and make recommendations. Louisiana was faced with a problem in the Negro vote. Negroes constituted nearly one-half of the total and on some occasions had an actual majority registered. Some method had to be found to restrict the colored vote. A real danger would threaten Louisiana if there should come a division in the ranks of the whites; then one faction plus the ignorant Negro support could carry an election. All facts and plans were to be formulated by the next session of the legislature.<sup>39</sup>

With the state election settled, citizens of Louisiana directed their attention to the approaching presidential campaign. The demands of Populists in the Ocala platform had been presented to the Democratic national convention in Chicago and the Republican national convention at Cincinnati. The people met with direct repulse by both conventions. The only thing left them was

<sup>34</sup> *Times-Democrat*, June 4, 1892.

<sup>35</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, November 6, 1896. Senator Brian was father of H. L. Brian, prominent Populist from Winn parish.

<sup>36</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 27, 1892.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, July 8, 1892.

<sup>38</sup> *Louisiana Laws*, 1892, p. 35.

<sup>39</sup> *Times-Democrat*, November 17, 1892.

the ballot, which could be used more effectively if there was a definite candidate of a specific party for them to support.<sup>40</sup> In Louisiana the People's Party men were displaying great enthusiasm and activity. A delegation of forty-eight men<sup>41</sup> sent to the national Populist convention at Omaha, Nebraska, helped in the nomination of General James B. Weaver, a Federal of Iowa, and General James G. Field, a Confederate of Virginia, for president and vice-president, respectively.<sup>42</sup> Louisiana cast 32 votes in the People's Party convention.<sup>43</sup> In these nominations seemed to be the idea of a blending of the Blue and Gray or a drawing closer together of the North and the South.

One must not lose sight of the fact that a strong Farmers' Alliance yet existed in Louisiana. The state meeting in 1892 was held in Monroe, and the president, Thomas Scott Adams, expressed the desire to be relieved of his position.<sup>44</sup> Forty-seven parishes were represented at the meeting. President Adams in his address appealed to the advocates of the Farmers' Alliance to remain loyal to Democracy in the approaching congressional and presidential elections. It was feared that the People's Party element would "not only control the reorganization; but the policy of the order as well."<sup>45</sup> A resolution was passed "pledging the State and all subordinate unions to urge the police juries of the several parishes in the State where such is not already the case to set apart a special fund for the maintenance of the public schools."<sup>46</sup> This threat of a third party was not led by old line Farmers' Alliance men like Adams, but by new ones like Tannehill and Guice. If a third party entered the state field in Louisiana it was estimated that such a vote would be amassed by it that the state might go to the Republicans. November would furnish a showdown in electoral votes between Weaver and Cleveland. T. J. Guice was termed the "Demosthenes" of the convention. The old leaders, among them Adams, left for home when they found themselves in the minority. The People's Party group did take over leadership. Four state officers of the Farmers' Alliance were chosen from the People's Party, two were not. Two of the three delegates to the National Alliance were advocates of the People's Party, while a safe number of members

<sup>40</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, September 1, 1892.

<sup>41</sup> *Times-Democrat*, June 14, 1892; *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), July 3, 5, 1892.

<sup>42</sup> Stanwood, *op. cit.*, 513.

<sup>43</sup> *Times-Democrat*, July 5, 1892.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, August 2, 1892.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, August 3, 1892.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, August 4, 1892.

of the Executive Committee were advocates of that party.<sup>47</sup> Members were left free to pursue their own courses in political thought. President Adams' remarks in behalf of Democratic Party support were expunged from the records.<sup>48</sup> In summary, the Monroe meeting showed a large element in the Louisiana Alliance eager to drag that organization into politics in opposition to Democracy. It was true that they were not able to pledge the members to support Weaver for president. However, their decision to act independently of the Democracy in the fourth and fifth districts in both congressional and presidential elections and that the majority of new officers chosen were avowed Third party men are significant facts and indicate that the political and independent element in the Alliance was stronger than ever before.<sup>49</sup> The same independent element had drawn away a large white vote from the Democratic ticket in the state election in April and voted for its own Farmers' ticket.

The enemies of Democracy in Louisiana were experiencing just what they liked—a split in Democracy. If an agreement between Populists and Republicans could be made, the threat to Democracy would be even more grave. The Republicans planned to run on the issue of the continuance of the sugar bounty. A Republican plum was dangled in the call for a meeting in New Iberia of those interested in sugar, rice, and lumber, regardless of politics.<sup>50</sup>

The congressional campaign pot was boiling, but so was the presidential campaign waxing warm in Louisiana in 1892. Early in the fall, both Populist candidates toured the South. Field visited and spoke at several places in Louisiana.<sup>51</sup> In some of the parishes, St. Landry for example, the people were very enthusiastic over the Weaver-Field ticket. The space given by the Democratic press to the Populist movement was indicative of its growth. In the hill parishes many small farmers were leaving the ranks of the Democratic party and giving their support to the new. Steps were taken to end this schism.<sup>52</sup> "Ridicule was resorted to, and General Weaver's military and political records were aired in order to discountenance him in the eyes of the

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, August 5, 1892.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, August 6, 1892.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, August 7, 1892.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, August 9, 12, 1892.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, September 10, 1892.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, September 4, 1892.



voters."<sup>53</sup> During the Civil War, he had ruled a Tennessee district, the residents of which denounced him as "the most vindictive and bitter hater of the South in all the Union Army."<sup>54</sup> Not only was his military record scored, but his political record came in for its share of criticism. He had been "Democrat, Know-Nothing, Republican, and everything else he could be in order to get votes and hold office. . . ."<sup>55</sup>

The Arkansas election which was to take place September 5, was of vital interest and importance to Louisiana Democrats, as Populism was known to be strong in Arkansas. General Weaver had been invited down to speak and the Populists were making an intensive canvass. It was logical to assume that the vote would show the strength of the new party in Arkansas and to a certain extent in the South. If the vote indicated an increase in Arkansas Populists, the Third party would become an issue in the November election in Louisiana, and the Democrats would have to campaign vigorously.<sup>56</sup> The Australian ballot system was used. Although a full Democratic vote was cast, there was a large falling off in the colored Republican vote due to the indifference and unfamiliarity with the new Australian ballot system. The People's Party candidate led the Republicans. The Democratic candidate, Fishback, had a majority of 16,329 over his opponents, Whipple and Carnahan, Republican and Populist, respectively.<sup>57</sup>

The result of the election was received by Louisiana Democrats as a real victory, but their jubilation was short-lived when they learned that during the contest in Arkansas there had been a "tacit understanding between Republicans and Populists. Republicans were to support the Farmers' Alliance in the State ticket and secure in return Alliance support for their electoral ticket in November."<sup>58</sup> This was considered an unfavorable development.

The "letter of acceptance" from the Third party candidates was issued from Pensacola, Florida, on September 17. The content was vague and somewhat indefinite. Although these candidates had been nominated on July 4, yet they did not accept until they had taken time to investigate the wrongs afflicting the southern people and states. These gentlemen found that the people

<sup>53</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 8.

<sup>54</sup> *Times-Democrat*, September 4, 1892.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, September 5, 1892.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, September 6, 1892.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, September 7, 1892.

were in poverty and their substance was being devoured by heartless monopolists, trusts, and money sharks. Labor was largely unemployed, and where work was obtained the wages were for the most part unremunerative. It was declared that each of the two major parties was under monopoly domination and had assumed an attitude of utter disregard for the people. The latter was genuinely true in Louisiana where people lacked confidence in the integrity of election judges. The solution was: elect your People's Party candidates and "an era of universal good feeling, prosperity and content among all classes of people" will result.<sup>59</sup>

On October 1, the People's Party state executive committee met at Alexandria and chose the following electors:

Electors at large— { A. B. Booth of Orleans  
                                  J. W. McFarland of Claiborne  
First District—J. B. Cameron of Orleans  
Second District—J. J. Sullivan of Orleans  
Third District—V. E. Dupuis of Lafayette  
Fourth District—J. J. Stewart of Webster  
Fifth District—R. H. Ward of Morehouse  
Sixth District—B. F. Hardesty of St. Landry<sup>60</sup>

Mr. V. E. Dupuis, a prominent Lafayette citizen and president of the Farmers' Alliance of Lafayette parish, declined to serve as a People's Party elector, because he was a Democrat and was considering joining no other party.<sup>61</sup>

The Weaver-Field "letter of acceptance" was obviously a vote-getting scheme for the national People's Party. They saw in the southern political situation an excellent opportunity to split the "solid South" with benefit to themselves. "Just what its immediate effects were, besides drawing the fire of the Democratic press, it would be difficult to say." One thing certain is that heavy inroads were being made in the ranks of the Democrats of Louisiana by the Third party men. The Democrats were torn by dissension, and hardly in a position to resist disintegration. In warning Democrats that they were hardly in a condition to permit internal dissension the Baton Rouge *Advocate* said:

The breaches must be closed and strengthened preparatory to a vigorous assault all along the line. An active, enthusiastic campaign must be at once inaugurated in order to carry the principles of Democracy victorious over the com-

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, September 20, 1892.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, October 2, 1892.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, October 8, 1892.

bined assaults of the Republicans and Populists. . . . Oily-tongued demagogues, in many instances the paid agents of the Republican party, have for months been circulating among the unsophisticated and more credulous classes, preaching their heresies and teaching the people that if Weaver is elected President money may be had for the asking; transportation on the railroad trains will be practically free, and the laboring man will be transferred from his present condition and placed upon a throne of power, while lakes filled with molasses, whose shores are fringed with buckwheat cakes, and islands of Jersey butter rise here and there above the surface, will be a concomitant of every farm. The "forty-acres-and-a-mule" promises of the reconstruction era pale into insignificance beside the glowing pictures of prosperity promised by the average Populist orator to those who support Weaver. These issues must be met. It will not do to simply pooh pooh their absurdity.<sup>62</sup>

Although the foregoing quotation is not regarded as literally true, yet it does shed interesting light upon campaign methods in Louisiana. It was a lamentable reflection upon the intelligence of people who could be swayed by such promises. Certain worthy facts deserve note. The People's Party had become a political force with which to reckon. Its propaganda and issues were being aired by speakers and by means of the press. Most significant of all was the inferred understanding between the members of the People's Party and the Republicans. This disposition to combine with the minority party was a characteristic of Populism everywhere.<sup>63</sup> In Louisiana the understanding was as yet purely tacit. Not until the breach in the Republican ranks had been closed could this combination of Republicans and Populists become well developed. The two Louisiana Republican groups were known as the Leonard and Warmoth factions. Each claimed to be the recognized organization in the state, and even two representatives from Republican national headquarters met with failure in an attempt to unify these factions.<sup>64</sup> Finally between themselves they reached an agreement. The Warmoth representative withdrew their electoral ticket and congressional candidates and accepted Leonard leadership.<sup>65</sup> A committee of fifteen—ten from the Leonard faction and five from Warmoth's side—were asked to work out satisfactorily the points at issue.<sup>66</sup>

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, October 3, 1892, quoting *Baton Rouge Advocate*.

<sup>63</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 10.

<sup>64</sup> *Times-Democrat*, September 27, 1892.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, October 5, 1892.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, October 6, 1892.



Now, the way was clear for an alliance with the Third party men. Negotiations were in process for some time. A pending proposition for fusion was published the middle of October.<sup>87</sup> The actual agreement took place in a joint meeting on October 20. Members of the conference committee were the campaign committees appointed by the executive committees of the People's Party and the Republican Party.<sup>88</sup> The agreement provided for a combination congressional and electoral ticket.

1. The People's party could choose one elector from the State at large and one elector from each of the Third, Fourth, and Sixth Congressional districts—making four in all.

2. The Republican party could choose one elector from the State at large and one elector from each of the First, Second, and Fifth Congressional districts—making four in all.

3. The Republicans were not to run any candidate for Congress in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth districts, but should support instead candidates of People's Party.

4. The People's party was not to run any candidate for Congress in the Second or Third Congressional districts, but instead should support the Republican party candidates.

5. Neither Republican nor People's party was to nominate a candidate for Congress in First district, but promised to support an Independent or Independent Democrat against regular Democratic nominee.

In the conduct of this fusion campaign every honorable means possible was to be used by both parties to elect the entire fusion ticket, "both the presidential electors and congressional candidates, but when elected they shall not be under any pledge or promise, one to the other, but shall in all matters stand relatively to each other the same as if elected by their respective parties, without the assistance of the other party to the contract."<sup>89</sup>

When the agreement to fuse was revealed to the public, each of the campaign committees—Populist and Republican—issued an address to the Louisiana voters. The Populists in their address called attention to the increasing poverty of the masses, the increasing wealth of the monopolies, the corrupt alliances entered into between "those who usurp too great a share of the profits of the producers of wealth and the professional politician." This

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, October 15, 1892.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, October 21, 1892.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, October 15, 1892.

condition, it was charged, had destroyed the usefulness of both the Democratic and Republican parties. Republicans could not secure a fair count of the votes, as the state election machinery was in the hands of the Democratic politicians. By fusion the People's Party hoped to elect some congressmen, and thus fight the Democrats with their own methods. In conclusion, an appeal was made to "the people" to have the manhood to assert their rights of freedom, not to permit the scarecrow of Negro supremacy to drive them "to the wigwam of the Democratic boss," and to rally to the People's Party standard and elect the fusion ticket as a rebuff to

the Democratic party in its strength, and the Republican party in its weakness. May Louisiana break the "solid south" and greet our great toiling brethren of the North and West with the cheering hope of industrial reform in the near future. A reform bringing with it the liberation of our producers of wealth from the dangers which threaten their further enslavement. A reform which will restore our government to what it was intended to be, "one of the people, for the people, and by the people."<sup>70</sup>

The Republican address simply called attention to the agreement stating that after deliberation and upon the advice of national leaders it had been consummated against the common enemy with the hope of obtaining a fair election. The various Republican congressional district committees were asked to give it their support.<sup>71</sup>

... the combination made with the Populists for a division of the electors and Congressmen, shows that the Republicans throughout Louisiana worth their attention, and believed that something could be accomplished by a vigorous political effort here.<sup>72</sup>

In the presidential election the Democrats carried Louisiana, Cleveland getting a popular vote of 87,922. Weaver, the People's Party Candidate, led Benjamin Harrison, the Republican candidate, by one vote. Weaver's vote was 13,282 to 13,281 for Harrison. The Democrats elected their entire congressional ticket in Louisiana.<sup>73</sup> Even Guice and Gunby, Populist nominees in Fourth and Fifth districts where Populism was strong, were defeated by large majorities.<sup>74</sup> Reports from various sections of

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, October 21, 1892.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, October 27, 1892.

<sup>73</sup> Stanwood, *op. cit.*, 517.

<sup>74</sup> *Daily Picayune*, November 10, 1892.

the state indicated a quiet election and light votes in some areas because of rain and in others due to absence of some white and colored laborers employed on sugar plantations.<sup>75</sup>

The national People's Party carried twenty-two electoral votes and over 1,000,000 popular votes. It elected four United States senators and eleven congressmen, besides carrying several states. This is a fair estimate of the need for a reform party.<sup>76</sup>

If one is to judge the growth and importance of the Louisiana People's Party in 1892, no better proof can be offered than the results of the congressional elections in the Fourth district in 1890 and 1892. The same candidates were opponents in both contests.

Year	Blanchard	Guice
1890	8,307	277
1892	16,432	5,167

One member of the Louisiana General Assembly elected in 1892 was a Populist. He was Senator B. F. Brian, of Grant parish, father of H. L. Brian.<sup>77</sup> The deplorable hard times of farmers for the next few years caused many persons to sever their old party affiliations and to cast their lot with the new People's Party in the hope of finding a panacea for their grievances.

#### CHAPTER IV

##### LOUISIANA PEOPLE'S PARTY, 1894-1896

Depression of 1893; *Louisiana Populist* newspaper; Democrats defeated Populists for Congress; Murphy J. Foster re-elected governor over Republican-Populist fusion; Legislature with eighteen Populists chosen; New Orleans Citizens' League; New electoral law; Provision for Constitutional Convention; Democratic congressmen elected; Democratic-Populist fusion in presidential campaign.

The Populists had figured less conspicuously in the elections of 1892 than had been expected of them. A large proportion of the votes credited to the Populists were fusion votes. In some sections the People's Party fused with the Democrats while in other states they fused with the Republicans. With the elimination of this fusion element, the Populist vote would fall far below estimations or expectations.

<sup>75</sup> *Times-Democrat*, November 9, 1892.

<sup>76</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, September 1, 1894.

<sup>77</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1894-1896*, 102.



In Louisiana before the congressional and presidential elections of 1892, the Populists and Republicans adopted a fusion agreement. So loud were their boastings that many persons were deceived. Although the election results showed a growth for Populism, yet they revealed that Democrats still controlled the Louisiana government.<sup>1</sup>

After the depression of 1893, both the Louisiana farmers and businessmen felt the pinch of hard times.<sup>2</sup> It was common talk in Louisiana that if the Democratic party had lived up to its principles and promises there would have been no place for a People's Party.<sup>3</sup> For every poison there is said to be an antidote, and the People's Party was declared the antidote for the monopoly poison.<sup>4</sup>

Populism was winning more and more converts, and many new party clubs were being organized throughout the state. Men were appointed to assist in forming these clubs. As chairman of these newly organized groups, they submitted monthly reports of the membership and actions of their various clubs. At least one club meeting should be held each month. Each ward was entitled to three members on the parish executive committee. Vacancies on this committee could be filled only by bona fide People's Party club members. The *Louisiana Populist* was designated as the official organ of the People's Party in several parishes.<sup>5</sup>

In 1894 indications were that free coinage of silver would be the chief issue in the November congressional election. Both the Republican and Democratic parties were accepting the principle of free silver coinage. This was proof enough that the old parties were aware of the fact that the keynote of the situation had been struck by the Populists. If the Populists were victorious in the November election, desired reforms would be carried into law. "No surer way of defeating reform measures" could be found than "to elect a so-called Democrat" on a reform platform.<sup>6</sup> The only way to save the farmers in the hill parishes from the clutches of Democratic-Republican leadership was to select and elect Populists to Congress. The People's Party was the only party that offered to correct the evils with reform legislation.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Times-Democrat*, November 11, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, September 16, 1896.

<sup>3</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, October 5, 1894.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, November 30, 1894.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, August 24, 1894.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

Space will not permit an enumeration of the many Populist club meetings in Louisiana in 1894, but all of them announced interesting meetings, and urged all members to be present. Candidates for Congress spoke at many of these meetings. B. W. Bailey of Winn Parish, the Populist candidate for Congress from the Fourth district, was nearly always the guest speaker.<sup>8</sup> Where he drew large crowds, often H. W. Ogden, the incumbent, would have only a small group to hear him speak.<sup>9</sup> The People's Party clubs helped keep alive the Populist enthusiasm.

The People's Party executive committee of the Fourth congressional district of Louisiana in meeting August 28, 1894, denounced "the Democratic national regime for wilfully surrendering the rights of the masses of the people to the sugar trusts, combinations and other powerful money powers." It was charged that politics, not patriotism, ruled the country. Since corporations had long contributed the campaign funds, the politicians had stood by the corporations.<sup>10</sup> The Democratic state government had failed to give the people of Louisiana the just and fair government they demanded. It had failed to give them a fair and just election law by which their votes could be honestly counted and returned as cast. The governor had ignored the voice of the people in making all his appointments, and this was contrary to the democratic principles of government. The committee endorsed the People's Party platform adopted at Omaha, Nebraska, in 1892. If only this could be enacted into law, it was believed that great relief could be brought to the people. M. F. Machen, editor and business manager of *Louisiana Populist*, was chosen president and John W. Brown was made secretary of the district executive committee. A congressional campaign committee was appointed, details for campaign work were attended to, and then the committee adjourned *sine die*.<sup>11</sup>

Hon. B. W. Bailey of Winn parish, the People's Party candidate for Congress from the Fourth congressional district, came from the ranks of the people and thoroughly understood their situation. He was described as "honest, young, vigorous, and intelligent" by one writer while another termed him a "conscientious gentleman with plenty of fire and vim." He assumed responsibility of his family at his father's death. In 1888, although

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, September 1, 1894.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, September 28, 1894.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, September 7, 1894.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

not old enough to vote, he took an active part for Cleveland. Soon he became convinced that relief could not come through either of the old parties. He became an active worker in the Farmers' Union and "became associate editor of the *Comrade*, a reform paper published in Winnfield and devoted to the principles of reform." When the Panic of 1893 came, he, as did many others, began to inquire from the cause to the effect. He owned the entire plant of the *Comrade* and at the time of his nomination was "running it as a reform journal in the interest of the People's Party." Mr. Bailey was not one of those old "war horses" who was contaminated with rings and clicks, but came as a candidate right from among the ranks of the people.<sup>12</sup> Although he was not a college graduate, one writer ventured "the misplacing of a 'comma' will not put diamonds on the free list."<sup>13</sup>

The People's Party was the only party that had a clear cut issue upon any of the grave questions confronting the nation. Any Democratic nominee would be without a platform except such as he might on his own authority fix up. The Democratic executive committee meeting at Natchitoches on September 3 set October 6 as the time for holding a primary election to nominate a candidate for Congress. Winn and Sabine parishes were not represented. The committee decided to keep the voting precincts open from 9 A. M. to 6 P. M., and allow only white Democratic electors to vote. Candidates were to be voted for direct and the candidate with the majority vote was to become the party nominee. The polls were to be properly managed, so as to avoid any charges of fraud or irregularity.<sup>14</sup> The "congressional bee" was troubling several bonnets, but it was certain that H. W. Ogden would be a candidate for re-election. Thirteen members of the committee were present; the personnel consisted of nine lawyers and one banker while the occupation or profession of the remaining three was not given.<sup>15</sup> Senator L. H. Pugh of Calcasieu parish resigned his position as a member of the Democratic executive committee from the Third congressional district, and severed his connection with the Democratic Party.<sup>16</sup> Other prominent Democrats were doing likewise. Mr. G. M. Wyatt, a staunch advocate of the People's Party, stated that 4½ cents cotton was making People's Party men daily.<sup>17</sup> Upon becoming a Populist,

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, September 21, 1894.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, September 14, 1894.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, September 7, 1894.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, September 14, 1894.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, October 5, 1894.



one might have to endure the jeers of people, but in the end these same people would begin talking the reforms that Populists advocated.<sup>18</sup>

The People's Party press in late September was very outspoken in its warnings to party members about the approaching Democratic primary. Populists were urged to have nothing to do with the Democratic primary, for if the Populists were hands off, it would show up the strength of the white Democratic voters of the Fourth district. The following was a warning to all People's Party men: "*Do not go to the Democratic primary election and tie yourself to the Democratic nominee, but hold yourself aloof, so you can vote as freemen on the 6th day of November, 1894.*"<sup>19</sup> H. W. Ogden, the Democratic incumbent, received the Democratic nomination over his opponent, Watkins. Both Democrats and Populists exerted much energy during the remaining month before the election of the Congressman from District Four.

The Populists accused the Democrats of the Fourth congressional district of presenting Mr. Ogden to the voters as an avowed advocate of free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. This was quite misleading as Mr. Ogden was already known to have endorsed Mr. Cleveland's administration which everyone knew was "diametrically" opposed to the free coinage of silver at any ratio. Populists felt compelled to accuse Mr. Ogden of straddling the fence in an attempt to be re-elected.<sup>20</sup>

*Louisiana Candidates for Congress in 1894*<sup>21</sup>

<i>District</i>	<i>Democrat</i>	<i>Populist</i>
First	Adolph Meyer	James Leonard
Second	Charles F. Buck	Charles Callaghan
Third	Andrew Price	John Lightner
Fourth	H. W. Ogden	B. W. Bailey
Fifth	C. J. Boatner	A. Benoit
Sixth	S. M. Robertson	Major M. R. Wilson

Each Populist candidate stood squarely on a platform of free coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1, the abolition of national banks, the restoration and control of the volume of money to the

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, as taken from letter of September 3, 1894, from a "planter" in Couly, Louisiana.

<sup>19</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, September 21, 1894.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, October 19, 1894.

<sup>21</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1894 to 1896*, 175-177.

government as before the fraudulent demonetization of silver in 1873, and government ownership of railroads. On the other hand the Democratic candidates were represented as running without being pledged to support any certain measure. In this event, they were responsible to themselves alone.<sup>22</sup> No man can truthfully claim that the Democratic party favored free coinage of silver at any ratio, because in 1892, with 148 Democratic majority in the lower House, they defeated a free coinage bill passed by a Republican Senate. Again in 1894, a Congress that had a 92 Democratic majority in the Senate, defeated a free silver coinage bill by a good safe majority. This certainly indicated the Democratic sympathies.<sup>23</sup>

In Louisiana the money question was the major issue in the Congressional campaign. Claims were made by the Democrats that the Sherman Silver Purchase Act was entirely responsible for the contraction of the circulating medium. The Populists claimed that no silver dollars had been coined by the Democratic administration since the repeal of the silver purchase clause of the Sherman Act. To counteract this damaging news, Mr. W. T. Armistead of Jefferson, chairman of the Democratic county committee, hit upon the plan of sending \$500 to the New Orleans Mint with a request that silver dollars of the year 1894 should be returned to him. His request was granted, and he and his Democratic leaders from Jefferson and adjoining counties circulated these at Populist campaign meetings. "The effect was instantaneous and the news spread rapidly that the Democratic administration was still coining silver dollars." It was finally made clear by the Secretary of the Treasury, J. G. Carlisle, that the Philadelphia, New Orleans, and San Francisco mints were coining silver dollars from bullion purchased in keeping with the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890. It was admitted, however, that these were only being coined in order to redeem the silver certificates issued in payment for the bullion. When these certificates were redeemed, they were destroyed and not another dollar was being placed in circulation.<sup>24</sup>

Reports from all over Louisiana indicated an increase in Populism with chances good for election to Congress of some Populist candidates. Many were convinced that the Democrats

<sup>22</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, October 5, 1894.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, November 9, 1894.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, September 21, October 26, 1894.

had violated campaign pledges, hence should not again be supported. Republicans could not be counted on either, as their policies were only for particular classes, while "the Populists had in view the welfare of the masses."<sup>25</sup>

The Populists feared that the remainder of Cleveland's Democratic administration would see the people's paper money destroyed. This would credit Democrats with destruction of silver and greenback currency, also.<sup>26</sup> The *Louisiana Populist* attributed hard times to "First, the contradiction and centralization of the currency by the infamous funding act of 1865, amended in 1866; and secondly, to the demonetization of silver in 1873 and 1893."<sup>27</sup>

There was great anxiety among the Louisiana Democrats as the election approached. One prominent Democrat said, "Keep away from Populist meetings, and if you can't vote the Democratic ticket, for God's sake vote the Republican ticket."<sup>28</sup> Despite the appeal for an honest election and a fair count, election day did not pass before charges of fraud and unfairness were made by Louisiana Populists, especially in the Fourth Congressional District. It was common belief that when the frauds were sifted out and the true vote ascertained, Mr. Bailey would be the duly elected congressman over H. W. Ogden. Natchitoches parish reported a quiet and a fair election—the first since the Civil War. Rapides, Red River, De Soto, Caddo, and Bossier parishes charged gross frauds. The People's Party commissioners were debarred from serving; Democrats marched Negroes up to the polls and voted them under threats and by intimidation, and poll books were tampered with. In Bossier parish ten Negroes voted to one white, so this parish "came to the relief of the Democrats in maintaining white supremacy with 2,500 majority Negro votes."<sup>29</sup>

All the hill parishes where the white people are in the majority, the Populists polled big majorities, but in the river parishes where the Negroes were in the majority the Democrats succeeded in maintaining white supremacy (?) with the Negro votes. . . . The parish of Lincoln, which is a white parish went Populist, but the Democrats of the Fifth district congratulated themselves on the fact that Tensas and Ouachita with their Negro majorities came to their aid in maintaining white supremacy (?).<sup>30</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, September 28, 1894.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, October 19, 1894.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, November 2, 1894.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, November 3, 1894.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, November 9, 16, 30, 1894.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, November 16, 1894.



In St. Landry parish three of the strongest Populist polls were not open because of political machination.<sup>31</sup> Notices were served by several of the defeated Populist candidates that they would contest the election results. These protests and investigations did not alter election results, but did point to a real need for election reform. Each of the six congressional districts returned a Democrat to Congress. The Populists carried ten parishes and polled a total of 13,988 votes. Even this is not an accurate estimate of Populist strength, for in the First, Second, and Third congressional districts where the proponents of a sugar bounty were to be found, the Republican nominees received most of the agitation votes.<sup>32</sup>

From over the nation came reports of elections in which Populism showed a gain. Where the total Populist vote had been one million in 1892, it had increased to two million in 1894. The Republicans were victorious and would control Congress for the next two years. The Democratic membership was reduced to less than 100. This was the worst squelching since Grant's days, and to the Populists and their struggle for reform should go most of the credit for this change of leadership.<sup>33</sup>

"Before the actual formation of the People's Party, farmers' organizations had set out to capture votes by advocating free silver. After the election of 1892, free silver captured the Populist organization."<sup>34</sup> The congressional and state elections of 1894 revealed the unstable equilibrium of parties, and reflected the growing, popular unrest. All political moves in 1895 were calculated with reference to the presidential election of 1896. "Both old parties were inoculated with the free-silver virus; silver men could have passed a free coinage bill in both houses of Congress at any moment but were restrained chiefly by the knowledge that such a measure would be vetoed by President Cleveland."<sup>35</sup> The chief demand of Populism was free coinage of silver, and in 1894 it was predicted that a free-silver president could be elected in 1896, if only all the free-silver men would vote together.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, July 12, 1894, quoting letter from J. H. Humble to H. L. Brian, editor of *Louisiana Populist*.

<sup>32</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1894-1896*, 175-177; *Louisiana Populist*, March 8, 1895.

<sup>33</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, November 23, 30, 1894.

<sup>34</sup> Solon J. Buck, *Agrarian Crusade* (New Haven, 1920), 163.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 168-169.

<sup>36</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, September 28, 1894.

The year 1895 was not an idle one for voters of Louisiana, as plans were consummated for the important election year ahead. Two issues were demanding solution: namely, ballot reform and free coinage of silver at 16 to 1 ratio. In early April, the Fourth Congressional district was organized by the People's Party for the state campaign of 1896.<sup>37</sup> Hon. W. B. Boggs, of Bossier, had proposed a silver resolution at the last session of the legislature. It passed both houses only to be killed by Governor Foster's veto. This resolution was supported by all the Populists in the legislature. A few months later many fence-straddling politicians who had voted against the resolution had become interested advocates of free and unlimited coinage of silver by the United States.<sup>38</sup>

Senator N. C. Blanchard is credited with launching Governor Murphy J. Foster's candidacy for re-election in a speech late in September 1895. Silver men were begged not to draw the line on the present executive even though he was a goldbug, but to support him. The Democrats of Louisiana declared their intention of nominating a full state ticket and electing same without any assistance from Populists and Republicans.<sup>39</sup> Numerous overtures were tendered the Louisiana Populists in an attempt to get them to return to the Democratic fold. One revealing article scoffed at the idea of the Populists being invited to return to a party sustained and upheld only by the ability of the machine to vote dead Negroes . . . to a party that is fighting free silver. . . to a party which recognizes as its governor . . . a man upon whose head rests the stigma of fraud . . . to a party, the governor of which, in this State, is a sworn foe to the Alliance and to ballot reform, and who is seeking a renomination for the office which he has held, but upon which S. D. McEnery has a claim . . . to a party whose chief organs fight a white primary, practically endorsing a mixed one thereby. . . .<sup>40</sup>

Mr. Andrew Hero, Jr., of the old-line Republicans, and Dr. C. McD. Puckett, of the sugar planter Republicans, were present at the People's Party state central committee meeting in August 1895, and when introduced by the chairman stated that

if the Populists would put out a representative ticket of honest, competent men on their platform, but denouncing the suffrage amendment, that their respective factions com-

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, April 19, 1895.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, May 31, 1895.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, September 27, 1895, quoting *Natchitoches Enterprise*.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, December 6, 1895.

prising the whole of the Republican Party of this State would support the same in the interest of fair elections, and universal suffrage.

The committee assured the representative Republicans that the Populists would continue their opposition to the suffrage amendment and that their platform would denounce same and stand for free silver and fair elections, and that the ticket nominated thereon would be liberal and broad gauged.<sup>41</sup>

At a conference in Alexandria, November 26, 1895, the sugar-planters, Populists, and Republicans agreed to let the People's Party lead the fight through its own organization and under its own name. A strong man of North Louisiana like Judge Gunby who was willing to break away from the Democratic party should be selected to head the ticket. The People's Party convention was to name a ticket from among silver-Democrats, sugar-planters, Republicans, and Populists—factions opposed to Fosterism. The campaign for this ticket was to be conducted chiefly in North Louisiana, and wherever else the party was strong, through the People's Party, its speaker and its press.<sup>42</sup>

The only parties to this agreement who violated it prior to the Populist convention on January 8, 1896, were the sugar-planters who met at Hotel Royal in New Orleans on January 2 and nominated a partial state ticket. Hon. E. N. Pugh, a sugar planter of Ascension and a former Democrat fusion candidate, was nominated by the sugar-planters for governor. He declared himself in favor of white supremacy and of the suffrage amendment as assuring white rule in Louisiana. It was believed that he and the other nominees on his ticket would get the support of the regular Republicans and Populists. This was a premature assumption, for Pugh was objectionable to the regular Republicans because of his ultra white supremacy stand, and to the Populists because of his failure to take a stand in his platform on silver coinage.<sup>43</sup>

The Democratic State Convention met on January 3, in Shreveport, renominated Hon. Murphy J. Foster for governor, and reaffirmed their allegiance to the Democratic principles. Their platform endorsed the suffrage amendment, endorsed gold by saying the silver question belonged to national politics, and endorsed the Monroe Doctrine.<sup>44</sup>

<sup>41</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, December 6, 1895.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, January 17, 1896.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, January 17, 1896; *Times-Democrat*, January 5, 1896.

<sup>44</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, January 3, 10, 1896.



*Democratic Ticket*

Governor—Murphy J. Foster  
Lt. Governor—Robert H. Snyder  
Auditor—W. W. Heard  
Treasurer—J. A. Fournet  
Atty.-Gen.—M. J. Cunningham  
Sec. of State—John T. Michel  
Supt. of Ed.—J. V. Calhoun<sup>45</sup>

According to the Populists, the Democratic party was a conglomerate group made up of "high tariff men and low tariff men, gold bugs, silver bugs, green-backers, lottery and anti-lottery, prohibitionists and anti's, single taxers and double taxers, Republicans, Populists and Democrats—a heterogeneous [*sic*] mass led by ballot-box stuffers and bull-dozers."<sup>46</sup>

The People's Party convention met January 8, in Alexandria. The majority of the delegates came from the hill parishes while a hopeless minority came from the sugar area in South Louisiana and the Florida parishes. It early became known that Mr. A. B. Booth favored and urged the Populists to accept the sugar-planters ticket, headed by E. N. Pugh, for governor. The Populists promptly sat down on the proposition for fusion with the Republican nominee, and the contest reduced itself to a choice between Judge Gunby and Mr. Booth for leadership. Gunby begged to withdraw and pledged his support to the Populist ticket. Mr. Booth was given the nomination in good faith, and the delegates little dreamed that it was his intention to turn it over to Pugh and the sugar-planters later on.<sup>47</sup>

*First Populist Ticket<sup>48</sup>*

Governor—A. B. Booth, of Orleans  
Lt. Governor—L. White, of Ouachita  
Sec. of State—J. W. McFarland, of Claiborne  
Auditor—J. P. Kleinpeter, of East Baton Rouge  
Treasurer—A. T. Nelson, of Claiborne  
Public Education—Dr. G. A. M. Cook, of St. Landry

When found out, Booth's treachery was explained to the caucus which tried in vain to secure his resignation. The nominees on the ticket for other state offices promptly resigned or declined to run when notified of Booth's plan. The Populists had

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, January 3, 1896.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, January 10, 1896.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, January 17, 1896.

<sup>48</sup> *Times-Democrat*, January 10, 1896.

hoped to unify all opponents of Fosterism under the same banner, so Booth proved very short-sighted in his scheme that would have combined sugar-planters and Populist groups while alienating the Regular Republicans and Silver Democrats.<sup>49</sup>

Although Mr. Booth had been nominated by the Populist convention, his nomination was not approved by the state central committee of the People's Party. This group submitted a new ticket:

subject to the approval and support of the partial ticket made by the convention (not to Mr. Booth's approval alone) . . . the new ticket has received the approval and support of, not only every man of the convention ticket save Booth, but 3-fourths of our press and 3-fourths the people as well—two Populist parishes having met and denounced the Executive Committee, and eighteen having met and indorsed the new ticket. . . .<sup>50</sup>

Captain J. N. Pharr, a Republican and one time steamboat captain, and later temperance lecturer and planter, was chosen the Populist nominee for governor of Louisiana. This new ticket was to be put into effect subject to the final declination of Mr. Booth, gubernatorial nominee.<sup>51</sup> The new ticket presented had three Republican nominees and four Populists.<sup>52</sup>

#### *Second Populist Ticket*

Governor—J. N. Pharr, of St. Mary  
Lt. Governor—J. B. Kleinpeter, of East Baton Rouge  
Sec. of State—J. W. McFarland, of Claiborne  
Auditor—H. P. Kernochan, of Plaquemine  
Treasurer—John Pickett, of Bossier  
Attorney-General—L. F. Suthon, of Terrebonne  
Public Education—Dr. G. A. M. Cook, of St. Landry

Pressure was brought to bear on Mr. Booth to resign, but not until April 15 in a statement to the People's Party of Louisiana did he announce his withdrawal and pledge his support to John N. Pharr.<sup>53</sup>

A "mass convention" of sugar planters met in New Orleans on January 27, pulled down their ticket and indorsed the nomination made by the Populists of Mr. Pharr. After this they accepted the full Populist ticket. Their platform contained two

<sup>49</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, January 17, 1896.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, February 28, 1896.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, January 21, April 21, 1896.

<sup>52</sup> *Times-Democrat*, January 24, 1896.

<sup>53</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, April 17, 1896.

principles—suffrage and protection. So enthusiastic was Mr. H. L. Brian over this Populist recognition, that he promised them a rousing majority in North Louisiana.<sup>54</sup> The Regular Republicans indorsed the Pharr state ticket with practical unanimity at their convention on January 29.<sup>55</sup>

The Democratic press got busy and in reporting the Republican convention revealed some startling facts. One would have been shocked to see the Regular Republican convention. In order to assume an air of respectability, it pushed to the forefront the sugar planters. Behind them was found the Negro. The Regular Republican Party was distinctly a Negro party. About one in every fifty delegates was white; both the temporary and permanent chairman were Negroes. The mere suggestion of a white for these places threw the delegates into bedlam.

We do not believe that the voters of Louisiana will be deceived by the Pharr ticket, or the Populists, or the Nationals. They need only look behind the ticket to see what is threatening us again—the Negro, to get rid of whom politically cost many millions in money, so many valuable lives and so many years of suffering and agony.<sup>56</sup>

The Louisiana campaign was most important. Interest was taken by neighboring state newspapers in the election. One said:

We have very little thought that the Populist-Republican combine stands any show of winning in Louisiana, but at the same time the Democracy of that State should pull itself solidly together and make an aggressive and thorough campaign. Populism is strong in the northern part of the State and Republicanism strong in the sugar districts, and if the Democrats let the canvass go by default it is possible that the result may surprise them.<sup>57</sup>

Captain Pharr accepted his nomination for governor many times orally, but eventually he felt called upon to do so in writing. In making his address he mentioned the chairmen of the Populists, National Republicans, and Republicans in the order in which they tendered him the nomination. Because of their wide variance of desires and reforms, he became a candidate almost without a platform and without a party. To take a definite stand on any issue would be to offend one group of his supporters,<sup>58</sup> all of whom desired to defeat Fosterism. The only items in common

<sup>54</sup> *Times-Democrat*, January 28, 1896; *Louisiana Populist*, February 7, 1896.

<sup>55</sup> *Times-Democrat*, January 31, 1896.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, February 1, 1896.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, February 4, 1896, quoting *Natchez Democrat*.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, February 7, 1896; *Louisiana Populist*, February 7, 1896.



that the three parties had were: opposition to the suffrage amendment and desire for protection at the hand of the national government.<sup>59</sup> Captain Pharr, who had never before been an office-seeker, in writing to the three Louisiana party leaders, had the following to say:

I am unalterably opposed to the ratification of the suffrage amendment proposed by the last Legislature, avowedly for the purpose of maintaining the government in the hands of the Democratic party, and for that sole purpose. I am and have always been in favor of the protection of all American industries and American labor, and I am for a free vote and an honest count.<sup>60</sup>

It was predicted that many Populists would not support the fusion tickets, as they would not vote for Republicans; they would vote the Democratic ticket first. After all, most of the Populists had been Democrats a few years before. Their reason for leaving the party was because they differed with it on several issues; yet, with all this, they were much nearer Democrats than the Republican party of trusts and monopolies.<sup>61</sup> At a Populist mass meeting held in Union parish, resolutions were adopted opposing the ticket nominated by the state central committee. They called it a fusion with the Republicans, and demanded that a state convention be called to meet at Monroe, Louisiana, on February 28, 1896, to ratify the action of the Populist convention at Alexandria when Booth was nominated or to put out a new state ticket, composed of men who advocated the principles of the People's Party. All parishes were requested to select and send delegates to this convention. It was suggested that parish meetings be held not later than February 22. Later Populists of Jackson and Lincoln parishes repudiated the combine with Republicans,<sup>62</sup> so all Populists were not unified.

In the meantime the state campaign got under way in Louisiana. It started in North Louisiana, and probably this was a good thing for then the strength of the Populists north of Red River could be determined. The Populists were divided over the issue of Booth vs. Pharr, while the straightout Populists were opposed to fusion. In South Louisiana still more disunion was observed among the Republican factions. Even though an attempt at union had been made it was not genuine. It was pre-

<sup>59</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 8, 1896.

<sup>60</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, February 14, 1896.

<sup>61</sup> *Times-Democrat*, February 11, 1896.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, February 8, March 16, 1896.

dicted that the Democratic party would be more strongly united by the campaign in appealing to white supremacy for approval of the suffrage amendment.<sup>63</sup>

Since the days of Radical Republican reconstruction the southern states had been subjected to the consequences of Negro voting. Since 1867, in Louisiana, it seemed safe to assert, there had not been a popular election in which the Negro vote had been a determining factor or balance. Every two years the Negroes banded together for the purpose of selling their votes to the highest bidder. This brought forward the cry of Negro supremacy vs. white supremacy.

The People's Party-Republican fusion lasted through the congressional campaign of 1894,<sup>64</sup> the state campaign in the spring of 1896, up to the national free silver campaign in the fall of 1896. "It introduced a formidable opposition for the Democrats, and introduced a particularly disturbing factor: the Negro, politically suppressed since reconstruction days, was now, owing to the trend of developments, courted for his vote. Fears of Negro domination began to be expressed."<sup>65</sup> The right-thinking Democrats were alarmed at the danger threatening the state, and as the time for the state election approached they became convinced that the opportune time for a settlement was at hand.<sup>66</sup> The Democratic legislature prepared a suffrage amendment to the constitution for submission to the voters. The suffrage amendment provided as follows these voting qualifications.

Every male citizen of the United States by birth or naturalization, who is twenty-one years old, or upward, possessing the following qualifications, shall be an elector to vote at any election by the people except as herein provided.

1. He shall be an actual resident of the State one year next preceding the election at which he offers to vote.
2. He shall be an actual resident of the parish in which he offers to vote at least six months preceding the election.
3. He shall be an actual resident of the ward or precinct in which he offers to vote at least thirty days next preceding the election.
4. He shall be a registered voter.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, February 21, 1896.

<sup>64</sup> *World Almanac*, 1895, pp. 402-403. In this election the Democrats repeated their success of 1892.

<sup>65</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 12.

<sup>66</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 4, 1896.

5. He shall be able to read the Constitution of the State in his mother tongue or shall be a bona fide owner of property, real or personal, located in the State and assessed to him at a cash valuation of not less than \$200.

6. The General Assembly at its regular session in 1896 shall have power, by a vote of two-thirds of all members elected to each House, and approved by the Governor, to modify, change or amend this article of the Constitution, and such modifications, changes or amendments when so adopted and approved shall become a part of the Constitution without the publication and submission to the popular vote required in Article 256 of the Constitution.<sup>67</sup>

Thus the amendment in addition to the usual age and residence qualifications contained an educational clause with a property qualification as an alternative. The Democratic press and leaders heartily favored the suffrage amendment. It became the principal plank in the party platform. It was believed that a Democratic victory at the polls, without other guarantees, would protect white supremacy for the next four years only, but that if the Negro won, if the amendment was defeated, nothing short of a revolution could wrest it from him in 1900.<sup>68</sup>

Ex-Governor S. D. McEnery in a speech at Thibodaux sounded the call to the Democratic factions to support the Democratic ticket and platform. He realized the importance of the campaign, as one for white supremacy in opposition to the combine of Republicans, Populists, sugar-planters, and other dissenting groups. He felt that the only solution to the difficulty experienced at election time lay in the ratification of the suffrage amendment. He ventured the opinion that the politicians were afraid to thwart the Negro's whim, and that "there is not in the whole State, with few exceptions, the moral courage to insist upon the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment regulating suffrage." He also said that "If we are to have peace and quiet in this State, if we are to have a well organized government, if we are to have a virtuous society and intelligent, growing, progressive spirit, we will be compelled to restrict the right of suffrage to its intelligent exercise. The Negro today is the dominant power in this State."<sup>69</sup>

The Populist-Republican fusionists were not the only reformers taking part in the spring campaign and election. There were many reformers—among them were the New Orleans busi-

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, April 5, 1896.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, April 3, 1896.



ness and professional men who organized a citizens' league and put up a full local ticket headed by Walter C. Flower, candidate for mayor in opposition to Charles F. Buck, candidate of the regular Democrats who then controlled the municipal government, against which had come exposures of graft and corruption due to ring politics. The ticket sponsored by Mr. Buck announced that it was opposed to the suffrage amendment.<sup>70</sup> This development was of concern to the Democrats of Louisiana as was also the action of the sugar-planters, who allied themselves with the Republicans in 1896 because they feared that a national Democratic victory would mean the end of tariff protection on sugar.<sup>71</sup>

The state campaign was marked by much disorder and some bloodshed. The most serious outbreaks occurred in St. Landry parish, a center of Populist strength. Most of these encounters resulted from registration troubles. As early as February the charge was made in St. Landry that M. L. Swords, the registrar, was allowing irregular registration. A clash in which two men were wounded occurred in March between the regulators who were attempting to keep the Negro from voting and officers bound to supervise registration of eligible persons.<sup>72</sup> The parish was really a bone of contention between the Fontenot Democrats (upholders of white supremacy by opposing Negro suffrage) and the Thompson Democrat-Populist combine (favorers of Negro suffrage). The real difficulty in St. Landry arose over the fact that registration was impeded. Palmetto is the heart of the Negro section of St. Landry and here usually about 400 Negroes registered and voted. When the books were opened for registration on March 27, Registrar Swords was accompanied by over 200 armed regulators, representing the "white supremacy" faction (Fontenot) of the parish. These men served notice that no Negro should register or vote. To prove their intention to carry out this plan, they promptly severely whipped one Negro and he left without registering. Others were kept away from the registration office by pickets, and when the office closed, not a single Negro voter had enrolled.<sup>73</sup> When the time for registration of voters in Washington rolled round on April 3, Mr. Swords failed to appear because the Thompson faction had armed guards stationed at all the town entrances to prevent the registrar from

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, April 2, 1896.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, April 9, September 21, 1896.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, February 21, March 16, 1896.

<sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, March 29, 1896.

bringing in armed men with him for the purpose of preventing Negro registration. The Republicans and Populists took possession and "went through the form of registering the Negroes." "Counter action was taken by organized bands of white men, supposedly Democrats, who, under the name of 'Regulators,' undertook to maintain white supremacy by whipping and killing Negroes in an effort to intimidate them."<sup>74</sup> Several days following the incident at Washington, an affray took place at Grand Prairie (a Thompson stronghold) between a crowd of Negroes under an armed leader and a band of white supremacists. These Negroes were on their way to Opelousas to register for the election, and the white supremacists challenged their right to do so. In the exchange of shots two Negroes were killed, several were wounded and many others were whipped. News of this encounter did not reach Opelousas until late afternoon. There the Thompson faction had registered Negroes all day, since Registrar Swords had come to Opelousas without "his army." So critical did the situation become that state troops were sent to St. Landry to restore order.<sup>75</sup> It was apparent that the Ballot Reform League was right in demanding a new registration law, as the disturbances in St. Landry, Plaquemines, Jefferson, and West Baton Rouge parishes pointed to the need.<sup>76</sup>

Ten days before the election Captain Pharr wrote Governor Foster a letter urging him to conduct the election according to law, and to see that an honest election was held. Other appeals were made for the governor to appoint commissioners from both parties to supervise the election. These demands were made in accordance with Act 181 of 1894, Section 13, which said: "That said commissioners of election shall be selected from opposing political parties, provided, there be a sufficient number of each political party resident in the said precincts competent to fill said offices."<sup>77</sup>

The state election which took place April 21 was one of the most disorderly ever held in Louisiana. Charges of ballot-box stuffing, fraud, and intimidation were too numerous to mention. On two occasions the militia had to be called out to quell riots.<sup>78</sup> Despite greatly reduced majorities the Democrats won again.

<sup>74</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 13-14.

<sup>75</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 3, 8, 10, 1896.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, March 1, 1896.

<sup>77</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, April 3, 10, 1896; *Louisiana Laws*, 1894, p. 226.

<sup>78</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 23, 25, 1896.

The legislature chosen, which had a membership of thirty-six senators and ninety-eight representatives, contained two Independents, four Independent Democrats, thirteen Republicans, and eighteen Populists, two of the latter being in the Senate and sixteen in the House.<sup>79</sup>

The New Orleans Citizens' League carried the city election. It was swept into office over "the ring" by a large majority of votes. Twenty-seven of its members were sent to the legislature. True to the prediction of Ex-Governor McEnery, the proposed suffrage amendment was defeated by methods proclaimed disgraceful.<sup>80</sup>

One-half of the Populists elected to the legislature were classified as planters, seven were farmers, one was a lumber manufacturer, and one was a teacher. Six were native-born citizens of Louisiana, four were born in Georgia, two in Alabama, while one was born in each of North Carolina, Kentucky, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Ireland. They were chosen by the following parishes: Acadia, Vernon, St. Landry, Grant, Lincoln, Claiborne, East Baton Rouge, Jackson, Union, Sabine, Natchitoches, Catahoula, and Winn,<sup>81</sup> located primarily in the southwestern, western, and northwestern sections of the state. These were areas of great Populist influence, but a large vote was cast for the Party in some of the Florida parishes.<sup>82</sup> True, its strength in the southwestern part of Louisiana was very unexpected.<sup>83</sup> The strong hold of Populism was

in the hill parishes of northwestern Louisiana, peopled mainly by small white farmers. This, it will be recalled, was the region where the Farmers' Alliance had been particularly strong, and where a heavy vote had been cast for the People's Party candidate for governor in the state election of 1892. Populism never gained much of a foothold in the cotton parishes of the delta, or in the sugar parishes; and it was never strong in the cities.<sup>84</sup>

The most critical situation growing out of the election concerned the governorship. The election officials declared that Governor Foster had been reelected by a large majority, but the fusionists positively refused to accept their report, claiming that

<sup>79</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1896-1898*, 6-13.

<sup>80</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 21, 1896.

<sup>81</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1896-1898*, 6-13.

<sup>82</sup> *Daily Picayune*, April 25, 1896.

<sup>83</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 23, 1896.

<sup>84</sup> White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 15.



such a result emanated from false returns. They sincerely believed that Pharr had been elected and determined to have him seated at all costs. Feeling ran high, and except in times of war, it is doubtful whether the people of Louisiana have ever been confronted with a more serious crisis than that which developed in the three weeks following the election. The conflict had to be settled, but how? No provision had been made in the constitution for such a crisis. A grand jury began to investigate the election, but serious objections were raised to this procedure, so it was abandoned. By law this privilege permitting free investigation of elections, where charges of fraud have been made, is granted to "the courts and both Congress and the Legislature." They "possess the power to do so not only as to the election of their members, but presidential and gubernatorial elections also." This was strictly not a power granted to the grand jury.<sup>85</sup> Pharr's supporters, Republicans and Populists, maintained that the state legislature was the logical tribunal for the trial of the case, and that in exercising the functions of a court it had authority to go behind the election returns.<sup>86</sup> Considerable wrangling resulted, and the Pharr group seemed to have had a degree of success, for it was decided to let the legislature just elected solve the matter. The legislature convened early in May, and the question of going behind the fraudulent returns to unseat Foster, occupied the first week of the new session. The struggle that ensued in the state capitol at Baton Rouge was bitter, while the city was thronged with armed supporters of both candidates. The Citizens' League legislators from New Orleans split over the controversy, one of them taking the lead in an effort to seat the fusionist candidate. Pharr's followers were given an opportunity to present their case, but the legislature in joint session decided by a vote of 87 to 47 that it did not have authority to go behind the election returns, and Governor Foster was declared reelected governor.<sup>87</sup> In Louisiana, a supreme court decision (the State *ex rel.* Hootsell vs. L. F. Mason, Secretary of State, 44 Annual, 1065) had stated that neither the legislature nor the secretary of state could go behind election returns.<sup>88</sup>

The election returns proved the failure of the then existing electoral law. To avoid a recurrence of the situation just reviewed

<sup>85</sup> *Times-Democrat*, April 28, 1896.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, May 3, 1896.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, May 15, 1896; *Louisiana Populist*, May 22, 1896.

<sup>88</sup> *Times-Democrat*, May 3, 1896.

it was felt that the legislature should take some action, even to changing the law.<sup>89</sup> Even though the decision in regard to the election was far from satisfactory to the fusionists, it was fortunately accepted by them. This situation had been so tense that Governor Foster had stored arms and ammunition in the state capitol and had summoned the state militia to maintain order. Doubtless the presence of these armed forces had something to do with the acquiescence of the fusionists.<sup>90</sup>

After deciding the contested election returns, the legislature was called upon to choose a United States senator. They had three candidates from whom to make a choice: Ex-Governor S. D. McEnery, Walter D. Denegre, and N. C. Blanchard. The first was the Democratic administration's candidate, the second was supported by Republicans and Populists, while the third was the choice of almost a solid North Louisiana, with the exception of the Populists and one or two Republicans. His opposition was made up of members of the Citizens' League, the combined Populists and Republicans and the sugar Democrats. By a vote of 68 to 66 over his opponent, Mr. Denegre, Mr. McEnery was called from the state supreme court bench to become United States senator from Louisiana.<sup>91</sup>

It was pointed out that Governor Foster's majorities had been received from the Negro parishes. In the twenty-five parishes where the white vote predominated Pharr carried twenty-one and Foster four. This was a fair indication "that the white people of Louisiana were compelled to submit to the Negro vote and the stuffed Negro vote."<sup>92</sup> The excess of ignorant votes cast in the spring election made many citizens determine to eliminate this element from politics before another primary. Most of the state newspapers championed such a move. However, if such an end was to be accomplished, changes in the fundamental laws of the state had to be made. The constitutional method of amendment had just been tried unsuccessfully in the case of the proposed suffrage amendment which was defeated largely by the influence of the politicians. In order to prevent such influences in the future Mr. James A. Ware, a Democrat of Iberville parish, introduced an act to provide for the calling of a constitutional convention. The legislature passed this act and it was approved

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, April 23, 28, 1896.

<sup>90</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, May 8, 22, 1896.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, June 5, 1896; *Times-Democrat*, May 20, 29, 30, 1896.

<sup>92</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, May 15, 1896.

July 7, 1896. It provided for submitting to the voters of the state, for their approval or disapproval, at an election to be held on the second Tuesday in January, 1898, a proposal for holding a convention in New Orleans, on the second Tuesday in February, 1898, and giving it full authority to frame and adopt a new constitution for the state without submitting it to the people. The membership of the convention was set at one hundred and thirty-four delegates, ninety-eight of whom were to be elected from the parishes and representative districts, while thirty-six were to be chosen from the state at large. There were certain prohibitions and limitations upon the powers of the convention. It could not introduce into the new constitution any provision "affecting the bonded indebtedness of the State, or of local political units, except under certain specific conditions. It could not alter the existing levee system, change the terms of office of assemblymen, judges, or similar officers, or change in any way the constitutional prohibitions on lotteries. The act also contained directions on voting for delegates, the oath to be administered to members of the convention," provision for financing the convention, and for proclamation by the governor of the election at least thirty days prior to the date of the election.<sup>93</sup>

Mr. Ware had, also, introduced an act to regulate and maintain the purity of the ballot. The legislature accordingly acted favorably on it, and the new electoral law was approved July 9, 1896. In its rather lengthy content, it provided for the use of the Australian ballot which was to be used for the first time in Louisiana during the presidential election of 1896. The law further provided regulations concerning notices of elections, officials at the polling precincts, the canvass and count of ballots, ballot-boxes, the delivery of ballots, and the giving of information to voters. Penalties were provided for any violations, and for having intoxicating liquors in polling places.<sup>94</sup>

No previous legislature had ever been confronted with more serious matters. In addition to general legislative problems, it determined the disputed election for governor, chose a United States senator, passed an act calling for a constitutional convention, framed new registration and election laws, and practically established a new suffrage.<sup>95</sup> This was a most significant legislative session.

<sup>93</sup> *Louisiana Laws*, 1896, No. 52; White, "Populism in Louisiana during the Nineties," *loc. cit.*, V, 16.

<sup>94</sup> *Louisiana Laws*, 1896, No. 137.

<sup>95</sup> *Times-Democrat*, July 9, 1896.



Approaching presidential and congressional elections occupied the attention of Louisiana voters during the summer of 1896. The Republican national convention met in St. Louis, June 16, and nominated William McKinley, of Ohio, and Garret A. Hobart, of New Jersey, for president and vice-president, respectively. They declared in favor of the gold standard.

The Democratic national convention met in Chicago, on July 7, and nominated William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska and Arthur Sewall of Maine for president and vice-president, respectively. Their platform advocated free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Many delegates from the Goldbug States refused to cast their ballots.

The People's Party national convention met on July 22 in St. Louis. Louisiana had sixteen delegates present. The convention adopted the usual Populist platform with its demands in regard to finance, transportation, land, and direct legislation. The nomination for vice-president was made first and Thomas E. Watson of Georgia was elected over all his opponents on the first ballot. William Jennings Bryan was chosen their candidate for president. "Middle of the Roaders" dominated the convention.

The National Silver Party convention met in St. Louis on July 22 simultaneously with that of the Populists. Their nominees by acclamation were William Jennings Bryan for president and Arthur Sewall for vice-president.<sup>96</sup>

The state election of 1896 marked the end of Republican-Populist fusion in Louisiana. By the time of the presidential campaign in November, most of the Populists were in hearty cooperation and accord with the Democrats. With a common candidate for president and a mutual interest in free coinage of silver, this was a natural state of affairs. From Calcasieu parish came the news that practically all the Populists in southwest Louisiana were planning to support Bryan and the Democratic ticket and platform. It was deemed foolish to let a grudge against local Democratic leaders prove an excuse for defeating Bryan and free silver.<sup>97</sup> It was a far more difficult matter to win over the men of north Louisiana, where memories of harsh treatment and political bitterness suffered at the hands of the Democrats in

<sup>96</sup> Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency, 1788-1897*, 532-557.

<sup>97</sup> *Times-Democrat*, September 5, 1896.

the spring still remained fresh in the minds of many. In September a newspaper intimated that it was perfectly obvious that Hardy L. Brian and the Populists he dominated in north Louisiana were not interested in fusion with the Democrats, but preferred a combination with the Republicans looking toward reward with local offices. They seemed willing to sacrifice Bryan and the silver issue in order to advance their own political interests by fusing with Republicans and the gold standard.<sup>98</sup>

Mr. J. M. Foster of Shreveport, chairman of the Democratic conference committee, worked very hard to bring about an understanding between the Populist and Democratic parties. An official conference of both parties was called for September 24 in Baton Rouge, and the desire was expressed that even though the Democrats and Populists were not in accord in April, it was hoped they could lay aside petty differences and unite for Bryan and free silver.<sup>99</sup> At the Baton Rouge conference, after each committee had held a caucus in which prominent leaders from other states were present, the Populist committee sent the following propositions to the Democratic committee:

1. Each party to pledge itself to a fair election.
2. To divide the electors in making up a common Bryan ticket by placing four Democrats and four Populists upon it.
3. To divide the Congressmen by conceding to the Populists the candidates for Congress in the fourth and sixth districts.

The Democratic committee agreed to proposals one and two, but rejected three because it was out of their jurisdiction. A second communication of two parts was sent to the Democratic committee. The first was accepted like the previous one, but the second provided that "they have four Democrats and four Populists on the Bryan ticket, but all pledged to vote for Watson for vice-president." The Democratic committee rejected this proposition, reiterating its desire of favoring the second part of the proposal. The granting to the Populists of four electors when they represented only one-fifth of the combined votes of the two parties was judged more than fair to Watson. The chairman of the Democratic and Populist committees who signed the agreement were James M. Foster and H. L. Brian, respectively.<sup>100</sup> In

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, September 8, 1896.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, September 16, 1896.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, September 25, 26, 1896.

addition the Democrats pledged themselves to a fair election. Doubtless pressure exerted from national Populist headquarters was an important influence back of this agreement.<sup>101</sup>

During the fall campaign and election in Louisiana there was a new party in the field, but it was not strong enough to influence results very much. At the Democratic national convention in Chicago in June, the free silver plank had been adopted. Thereupon, United States Senator Donelson Caffery, of New Orleans, bolted the convention and joined other bolters at Indianapolis on September 2. These delegates represented forty-one states and three territories. They proceeded to organize the National Democratic Party, chose Senator Caffery the permanent president of the convention, unanimously adopted a platform denouncing protection and favoring the gold standard only, and nominated John M. Palmer of Illinois for president and General Simon B. Buckner of Kentucky for vice-president.<sup>102</sup> Senator Caffery's actions were quite displeasing to many persons, especially the country Democrats, in Louisiana. They did not think his views were consistent with Democratic party principles; therefore, he was not worthy of the senatorial commission from the white voters of Louisiana. Said one friend from Tensas parish, "it would be the part of good taste for the Senator who holds such vastly different views from his Party to return the commission to the people who intrusted it to him."<sup>103</sup> Some went so far as to demand his expulsion from the senate.<sup>104</sup> When he returned to his home, Senator Caffery actively participated in forming the National Democratic Party of Louisiana. Its adherents were chiefly residents of New Orleans, the business and financial center of the state.<sup>105</sup> Steps were taken toward means of educating people—especially those favoring "sound money." The Louisiana "Goldbug Democrats" were asked to enter a fusion agreement with the Republicans, but declined, for the reason, as Senator Caffery remarked, they were Democrats and would stand for principle and consider no trade with the Republicans.

Presidential electoral tickets were put up by the Democrat-Populists, Republicans, Fusion-Republicans, and National Demo-

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, September 27, 1896.

<sup>102</sup> Stanwood, *op. cit.*, 557-561.

<sup>103</sup> *Times-Democrat*, August 4, 1896.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, September 21, 1896.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, September 11, 22, 23, 1896.



crats. The Democrat-Populist combine was overwhelmingly elected:

At large— { Ben Mitchell of Plaquemine Parish  
                   { J. W. McFarland of Claiborne Parish  
 First District—Albert Voorhies of Orleans Parish  
 Second District—Samuel J. Kohlman of Orleans Parish  
 Third District—G. A. Fournet of Calcasieu Parish  
 Fourth District—Lee McAlpin of Vernon Parish  
 Fifth District—R. M. Steele of Franklin Parish  
 Sixth District—J. T. Howell of East Baton Rouge Parish<sup>106</sup>

Great interest was manifested in the elections, which took place November 3. In the congressional contest in Louisiana all six districts elected Democratic congressmen as follows:

First District—Adolph Meyer  
 Second District—Robert C. Davey  
 Third District—Robert F. Broussard  
 Fourth District—H. W. Ogden  
 Fifth District—Samuel T. Baird  
 Sixth District—Samuel M. Robertson<sup>107</sup>

Although the Democrat-Populist fusion made the result of the presidential election a foregone conclusion, the Republicans with the additional sugar planter votes did not present a serious threat to the combination. The Gold Democrats were a mere handful. The popular vote of the state for president was 77,175 for Bryan, 22,037 for McKinley, and 1,915 for Palmer, the National Democrat candidate.<sup>108</sup> This had been a most exciting campaign all over the nation, but the *Times-Democrat* in an editorial commented that it was gratifying to observe that New Orleans and Louisiana had escaped the extreme bitterness that characterized the political campaign elsewhere.<sup>109</sup>

Four reasons were given for the honest and fair elections held in Louisiana, namely:

1. Excellent law became effective November 3 requiring every voter to be able to read the ballot.
2. Commissioners were required by law to do their duty fairly.
3. The Democratic Party had pledged a fair election.
4. The people were tired of wrongdoing and were eager for an honest election.

<sup>106</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1896-1898*, leaf added between pp. 32-33.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 28-31.

<sup>108</sup> Stanwood, *op. cit.*, 567.

<sup>109</sup> *Times-Democrat*, October 28, 1896.

The *Times-Democrat* made special efforts to give the news and the result of the election at an early hour on November 3. The news was to be "placed on screens by the two best stereopticons (one using the electric and the other calcium light) in the city."<sup>110</sup> William McKinley and Garret Hobart were chosen president and vice-president, respectively.<sup>111</sup> From all over the state came words of praise for the new election law. Among these comments were: "The new ballot is a success"; "the people are delighted with the new system of voting." Even the rural sections expressed satisfaction with the Australian ballot system.<sup>112</sup>

In Louisiana the year 1896 ended with a Democratic governor reelected for another four-year term, a legislature of Democratic leadership, a complete Democratic representation in Congress, and an overwhelming vote for Bryan for president despite his defeat in the nation. Many, many Populists had returned to the Democratic fold, and it was an acknowledged fact that Populism in Louisiana, which had largely been responsible for the passage of a new electoral law and the provision for a constitutional convention, had served well its day and was on the wane. By 1900 the People's Party had ceased to exist in Louisiana as a separate political party.

#### CHAPTER V

##### DECLINE OF LOUISIANA POPULISM, 1896-1900

Reform Press; Constitutional Convention of 1898; "Grandfather clause"; Populist propaganda; Democratic Congressmen, 1898; Donelson Caffery, Jr., Populist nominee for Governor; W. W. Heard, Democrat, elected; end of Populism.

Louisiana Populists had for years struggled to obtain ballot reform and to be delivered from the evil of ballot-box stuffing. Consequently, the legislature in 1895 decided to submit a suffrage amendment to the voters in their state election to be held in April, 1896. The suffrage amendment was framed by the Democrats; it was enacted by a Democratic legislature; it was endorsed by the Democratic state convention; therefore, it was a party measure of Governor Foster and his administration. The people were

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, November 3, 1896.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, November 4, 1896.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, November 10, 18, 1896.

in no way responsible for it.<sup>1</sup> However, it was later disclosed that Mr. J. A. Tetts, a Populist, had written the article advocating an educational qualification for voting. He asserted that the Negro did control politics in Louisiana, not voluntarily, but by supplying names for the poll lists of parishes such as: East Carroll, Madison, Concordia, Tensas, Bossier, Caddo, Red River, and Rapides. These parishes with their large Negro element were Democratic strongholds. In this region, the ballot-stuffer was dominant. It was the belief that a fair election law would give the advantage to no faction or party and the Negro element would be eliminated from politics.<sup>2</sup>

The proposed suffrage amendment was defeated in the April election, but the new legislature passed an Act which became a law upon approval by Governor Foster on July 9.

An Act to preserve the purity of the ballot by regulating the manner of holding and conducting elections; by providing an official form of ballot; by prescribing the time and method in which nominations shall be made and certified; for providing for the division of parishes, cities and towns into convenient election precincts; by providing for the appointment of officers to conduct such elections and defining their duties; by prescribing the manner in which the votes of electors shall be taken, and the count and returns thereof made; by providing for the punishment of violations of this law, and repealing all laws in conflict with the same.<sup>3</sup>

The Louisiana Reform Press was a very aggressive and alert organization. It had an affiliated membership of practically all Populist or reform newspapers. One reference cited twenty-one separate newspapers that were members of this association. These papers were responsible for molding and reflecting public opinion in all sections of Louisiana, but chiefly in the hill parishes.<sup>4</sup> The National Reform Press Association met in Memphis, Tennessee, February 22, 1897. The convention had over 300 persons present, representing about 2,100 Populist newspapers. Two Louisiana Populist newspapers were represented, namely: the *Louisiana Populist* (Natchitoches) and the *Banner of Liberty* (Minden). This meeting was the most encouraging event in the annals of straight Populism since the Omaha convention; it declared the outlook for the People's Party quite hopeful.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, April 3, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, May 29, 1896.

<sup>3</sup> *Louisiana Laws*, 1896, No. 137.

<sup>4</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, July 10, 1896.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, February 26, March 5, 12, 1897.



Chairman Butler of the National People's Party committee had tried in vain to secure the approval of a majority of the National committee delegates to call a national representative convention in 1897. The Reform Press Association before its adjournment in Memphis issued a call for such a convention of the People's Party to meet in Nashville, on July 4, 1897. The Nashville conference was not regular; representation was to be based on the straight Populist votes cast for president or congressmen in 1894. Upon this basis, Louisiana was entitled to six delegates. A state convention of the People's Party met June 15 at Alexandria, and chose thirteen delegates to the Nashville conference, among them Judge Gunby and B. W. Bailey. All above six were designated as proxies. This state convention, also, considered action that should be taken by the People's Party in the approaching campaign for the constitutional convention.<sup>6</sup>

Even though the Louisiana Populists were interested in national activities, yet they were more interested in local reforms and progress. At home in 1897, they busied themselves in behalf of the proposed Cane River Locks that would afford navigation of the River all the year at Natchitoches.<sup>7</sup> In the Teche country similar interest in improving waterways was found. The sympathetic interest and assistance of Congressmen and Senators was promised.<sup>8</sup> Simultaneously, with the agitation for improved water transportation, came interest in railroad building, chiefly in north and northwest Louisiana. To secure these proposed railroads, the wards or parishes involved had to vote a five-mill tax for ten years. There was only very slight opposition to this extra burden, as it was a foregone conclusion that rich timber lands could be developed, a ready outlet for products and passengers would be afforded, competition would bring about reduced freight rates, new towns would furnish local markets, and cane and grain crops would become economically feasible. Other benefits would be enjoyed by the citizens, since the railroad property added to the present property assessment would increase the parish tax-collections giving thereby money for longer school terms, more adequate schoolhouses, and improved public roads.<sup>9</sup>

Through their newspapers, the Populists who had agitated for railroads now began agitation for good roads. It was all

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, May 7, July 2, 9, 1897.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, March 12, 19, 26, April 2, 23, June 11, 1897.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, May 21, July 2, 1897.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, March 5, May 7, October 1, December 3, 1897; February 13, 1898; *Natchitoches Populist*, April 1, 1898.

right to have railroads, but to make markets accessible, good roads were desirable. The farmers in the parishes urged the need for improved roads. One citizen suggested using parish convicts on the public roads; this suggestion was followed by the comment that perhaps more convicts would pay their fines. Louisiana was gradually waking up to the need for good roads. Possibly the losses of the Civil War were partly responsible for her backwardness along this line, but her failure to have better highways doubtless resulted from the lack of vigorous agitation for improvement. In a systematic way, Louisiana tackled her need for better roads. Professor W. D. Taylor of Louisiana State University's engineering department undertook to collect needed information through the medium of a state-wide questionnaire. Upon the basis of his findings road legislation was to be sought.<sup>10</sup>

The election to decide whether or not a constitutional convention should be held, subject to the conditions enumerated in Act 137 of July 7, 1896, took place on January 11, 1898, and resulted in 36,178 votes for and 7,578 votes against the proposal. This convention had been vested with the full power to frame and adopt, without submission to the people, a new state constitution. Five dollars per diem plus traveling expenses not in excess of fifty dollars was provided for through a seventy day convention, and \$80,000 was appropriated for the expenses of the convention.<sup>11</sup> The convention, as had been provided, met in the old Mechanics' Institute in New Orleans the second Tuesday of February 1898. It was called to order by Chief-Justice F. T. Nicholls. It was composed of 36 members at large and 98 from the twenty-six representative districts. Nearly all of the 134 delegates were Democrats, but there were a few Republicans and one Populist, B. W. Bailey of Winn parish.<sup>12</sup> Hon. E. B. Kruttschnitt was elected president of the convention and Robert S. Landry was chosen chief clerk.<sup>13</sup> The convention remained in session until it adopted the Louisiana Constitution of 1898 on May 12. This document is outstanding in its elaborate provisions regulating elections and suffrage. Illiterate voters were to be denied the franchise unless they owned and paid taxes on prop-

<sup>10</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, March 4, 11, 18, 1898.

<sup>11</sup> *Louisiana Laws*, 1896, No. 52.

<sup>12</sup> *Biennial Report of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly, 1896-1898*, opposite p. 32.

<sup>13</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, December 24, February 11, 1898.

erty assessed in Louisiana at a valuation of three hundred dollars or more. Section 5 of Article 197 was the most important clause in this connection. It provided that:

No male person who was on January 1, 1867, or at any date prior thereto, entitled to vote under the constitution or statutes of any State of the United States, wherein he then resided, and no son or grandson of any such person not less than twenty-one years of age at the date of the adoption of this Constitution, and no male person of foreign birth, who was naturalized prior to the first day of January, 1898, shall be denied the right to register and vote in this State by reason of his failure to possess the educational or property qualifications prescribed in this Constitution; provided, he shall have resided in this State for five years next preceding the date at which he shall apply for registration, and shall have registered in accordance with the terms of this article prior to September 1, 1898, and no person shall be entitled to register under this section after said date.

Unless a voter applying under this section made proper application to the registration officer before September 1, 1898, he should be forever denied the right to do so. This clause was the famous "grandfather clause," the first of its kind. By inventing and adopting the "grandfather clause," Louisiana showed the rest of the southern states how the Negro could be disfranchised without interfering with the white voters. Several other constitutional changes deserve attention: the membership of the legislature was increased from 134 to 145,<sup>14</sup> salaries of the governor,<sup>15</sup> legislators,<sup>16</sup> and supreme court justices<sup>17</sup> were raised; the number of district attorneys was increased;<sup>18</sup> the Railroad Commission was created<sup>19</sup> and generous salaries provided for the commissioners;<sup>20</sup> the governor was declared ineligible to succeed himself,<sup>21</sup> and his power of appointment was curbed by making many important state officers elective; the membership of a grand jury was reduced from 16 to 12.<sup>22</sup> It was, also, provided that besides the other requirements, the voter in 1900 had to show his poll tax receipt for two years before, and these must

<sup>14</sup> *Louisiana State Constitution, 1898, Articles 13, 19.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 70.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 29.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 86.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 125.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 283.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 287.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 63.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 117.



show that the tax had been paid by December 31 of each year. This tax was to be used exclusively for schools.<sup>23</sup>

Interest in the People's Party organization began to wane after the elections of 1896. The newspapers during the next two years carried many notices about ward or parish meetings. In order to keep up as much enthusiasm as possible and to hold their membership, these meetings took on quite a social aspect. Camp meetings of several days duration were scheduled. Basket dinners and picnics were arranged for each one of the day meetings. These mixed business and pleasure gatherings were most enjoyable and popular.<sup>24</sup> On July 4, 1898, the Populists had picnics, fish fries, barbecues, and public speaking advertised.<sup>25</sup>

Another avenue of appeal was featured in the Party propaganda and squibs. Here are examples:

1. The Populists are opposed to all trusts except the one on the silver dollar, "In God We Trust."<sup>26</sup>

2. I want to be a Farmer  
And with the Farmers stand—  
An old straw hat upon my head,  
A pitchfork in my hand;  
And there before the thresher,  
With all my main and might—  
I'd grind out wheat for Shylock to eat  
And praise him day and night.<sup>27</sup>

3. Parody on "The Raven":

Then resumed the artful granger:  
"Politician, rogue and stranger, get thee  
gone from out my door! Only this and  
nothing more." Then he said in accents  
hearty, "I shall join the People's Party, and  
its great reform galore will give support  
for evermore."<sup>28</sup>

The Congressional election of 1898 in Louisiana did not prove very exciting. The main interest in the campaign was found in the Fourth congressional district. On September 15, a Democratic primary for the nomination of a candidate to Congress

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 198.

<sup>24</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, September 17, December 3, 1897.

<sup>25</sup> *Natchitoches Populist*, July 4, 8, 1898.

<sup>26</sup> *Louisiana Populist*, March 1, 1895.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, October 22, 1897.

<sup>28</sup> *Natchitoches Populist*, July 29, 1898.

from the Fourth congressional district was held.<sup>29</sup> Mr. Phanor Breazeale was selected their candidate. At the Populist nominating convention in the Fourth district, on October 1, 1898, Mr. H. L. Brian was nominated to Congress. This meeting indorsed the national platform adopted in St. Louis, July 22, 1896, and the state platform adopted at Alexandria, January 8, 1896, and urged voters to support A. C. Calhoun for railroad commissioner and H. L. Brian for Congress. Support was solicited from Populists and those Democrats, tired of fraud, bribery, trickery, corruption and rottenness.<sup>30</sup> In order to be sure you were voting the Populist ticket on November 8, you had only to "Stamp inside the circle under the plow and you vote the whole Populist ticket."<sup>31</sup> The vote in Louisiana was the smallest ever polled. The Democrats won in all six districts.

First District—Adolph Meyer

Second District—Robert C. Davey

Third District—Robert F. Broussard

Fourth District—Phanor Breazeale

Fifth District—Samuel T. Baird

Sixth District—Samuel M. Robertson<sup>32</sup>

Rapidly the membership of the Louisiana People's Party was diminishing. The most prominent State Populist newspaper (the *Louisiana Populist* later changed to *Natchitoches Populist*) suspended publication with the issue of March 10, 1899.<sup>33</sup>

The presidential election in 1896 had marked the beginning of the decline of Populism in Louisiana. Gradually the Third Party men returned to the Democratic organization. Several factors were responsible for the return of these "Prodigal Sons" to the Democratic leadership. In part this was due to the reviving prosperity, but one should not overlook the fact that the Electoral Law of 1896 and the work of the Constitutional Convention of 1898 did much to redress most of the Populists' local grievances. The Party had served well its day and generation, and noble had been its ideals and worthy its accomplishments. On April 17, 1900, when the state election was held, there were three tickets in the field: the Democratic, the regular Republican and the Republican-Fusion. The last named was headed by Donelson

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, September 16, 1898.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, September 30, October 7, 1898.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, November 4, 1898.

<sup>32</sup> *Report of the Secretary of State to His Excellency W. W. Heard, Governor of the State of Louisiana*, May 12, 1902, 580.

<sup>33</sup> *Natchitoches Populist*, March 10, 1899.

Caffery, Jr., the son of United States Senator Caffery.<sup>34</sup> The remnant of the Louisiana People's Party nominated and supported for governor young Caffery. He received only 4,938 votes, or only about one-half the number their first gubernatorial candidate, R. H. Tannehill, had received in 1892. Caffery did not carry a single parish; even Winn parish, the arsenal of Populist strength, went Democratic. The election was a sweeping victory for the Democrats in Louisiana, for they elected their nominee, William W. Heard, governor, and the entire membership of the newly chosen legislature was Democratic.<sup>35</sup> This election was the "swan song" of the Populists in Louisiana, for never have they put a ticket in the field since 1900.

<sup>34</sup> Alcée Fortier, *History of Louisiana*, IV, 244.

<sup>35</sup> *Report of the Secretary of State to His Excellency W. W. Heard, Governor of the State of Louisiana, May 12, 1902*, 564.

#### APPENDIX

#### SIGNIFICANT ELECTION RETURNS IN LOUISIANA, 1890-1900

[Compiled from *Biennial Reports of the Louisiana Secretary of State, 1890-1902.*]

#### *Louisiana Congressional Election Returns, November 4, 1890*

Parishes	First District		
	Adolph Meyer	H. C. Warmoth	Scattering
Orleans			
3rd	2,057	1,119	9
4th	849	493	4
5th	1,172	544	11
6th	1,224	299	11
7th	1,133	651	25
8th	936	216	21
9th	1,536	405	33
15th	685	652	..
St. Bernard	443	277	16
Plaquemines	789	1,499	6
(Total)	10,824	6,155	136



# *The Louisiana People's Party*

1125

Parishes	Second District		Scattering
	Mat. D. Logan	H. D. Coleman	
Orleans			
1st	1,395	307	2
2nd	1,630	389	7
10th	1,784	391	9
11th	1,626	515	14
12th	836	312	8
13th	492	313	2
14th	269	144	2
16th	188	235	9
17th	260	132	16
Jefferson	919	461	51
St. Charles	122	1,105	..
St. John the Baptist	477	931	84
St. James	950	1,177	218
(Total)	10,948	6,412	422

Parishes	Third District		Scattering
	Andrew Price	Taylor Beattie	
Iberville	1,634	48	2
Ascension	1,098	..	..
Assumption	1,096	..	..
Lafourche	2,550	..	..
Terrebonne	840	..	3
St. Mary	761	..	..
Iberia	975	..	..
St. Martin	450	..	..
Lafayette	516	..	6
Vermillion	264	..	..
Cameron	160	..	..
Calcasieu	974	..	..
(Total)	11,318	48	17 [?]

Parishes	Fourth District		Scattering
	Newton C. Blanchard	T. J. Guice	
Rapides	1,963	..	..
Sabine	269	90	11
De Soto	611	..	..
Natchitoches	978	..	35
Red River	645	2	..
Caddo	1,313	..	..
Bossier	952	..	..
Winn	75	..	1
Grant	272	10	..
Blenville	487	..	..
Vernon	222	175	..
Webster	520	..	..
(Total)	8,307	277	47

Fifth District			
Parishes	Charles J. Boatner	Smith W. Green	Scattering
Concordia	1,296	88	..
Caldwell	738	39	20
Franklin	392	..	..
Tensas	648	19	..
Madison	902	67	..
Richland	892	1	..
Ouachita	2,182	24	1
Jackson	181	..	..
Lincoln	952	..	50
Union	763	..	14
Morehouse	875	1	..
East Carroll	220	15	5
West Carroll	475	..	..
Clalborne	932	1	..
Catahoula	435	3	587
(Total)	11,793	258	677

Sixth District		
Parishes	Samuel M. Robertson	Scattering
Acadia	176	..
St. Landry	536	..
Pointe Coupee	469	..
Avoyelles	623	..
East Feliciana	622	..
West Feliciana	588	..
East Baton Rouge	684	..
West Baton Rouge	1,326	1
St. Helena	245	..
Livingston	255	..
Tangipahoa	412	..
Washington	442	..
St. Tammany	233	4
(Total)	6,611	5

*Louisiana Gubernatorial Election, April 19, 1892*

Parishes	M. J. Foster	S. D. McEnery	A. H. Leonard	J. E. Breaux	R. H. Tannehill
Acadia	1,670	224	111	78	223
Ascension	2,623	652	1,128	80	7
Assumption	989	927	1,721	..	..
Avoyelles	2,209	913	944	182	191
Bienville	1,121	324	2	3	533
Bossier	3,704	217	96	102	9
Caddo	2,469	658	234	25	92
Calcasieu	1,456	1,051	489	337	677
Caldwell	331	393	37	2	355
Cameron	289	93	31	35	..
Catahoula	428	410	360	81	853
Clalborne	2,040	393	690	1	109

1127

*The Louisiana People's Party*  
*Louisiana Gubernatorial Election, April 19, 1892—Cont.*

Parishes	M. J.	S. D.	A. H.	J. E.	R. H.
	Foster	McEnery	Leonard	Breaux	Tannehill
Concordia	1,500	399	289	21	83
De Soto	1,093	470	536	..	282
East Baton Rouge	1,477	1,004	1,617	323	3
East Carroll	91	210	110	985	107
East Feliciana	1,955	386	6	..	..
Franklin	662	360	148	46	39
Grant	311	56	246	122	543
Iberia	897	1,023	408	17	..
Iberville	1,517	1,025	816	589	10
Jackson	654	126	..	..	389
Jefferson	1,211	800	454	114	14
Lafayette	1,059	569	3	37	..
Lafourche	1,000	1,804	1,080	66	..
Lincoln	1,538	152	67	..	124
Livingston	553	265	214	..	139
Madison	3,030	34	80	162	7
Morehouse	1,083	301	16	33	2
Natchitoches	1,076	602	128	334	723
Orleans	11,516	18,589	5,661	2,152	71
Ouachita	1,549	1,249	6	22	28
Plaquemines	1,133	482	213	1,163	..
Pointe Coupee	671	746	2,069	31	6
Rapides	2,983	439	109	780	639
Red River	663	165	208	..	234
Richland	961	378	4	22	..
Sabine	950	109	..	..	735
St. Bernard	126	564	108	300	..
St. Charles	75	234	986	52	..
St. Helena	536	122	282	22	38
St. James	766	579	1,285	296	..
St. John the Baptist	320	586	1,273	18	..
St. Landry	3,434	611	1,223	2,419	183
St. Martin	965	359	3	1	..
St. Mary	3,134	381	429	103	4
St. Tammany	609	479	154	324	76
Tangipahoa	950	442	110	511	167
Tensas	207	190	1,264	190	..
Terrebonne	622	1,169	238	9	..
Union	2,147	276	4	67	242
Vermillion	1,013	854	203	70	71
Vernon	195	247	3	..	506
Washington	656	68	315	..	186
Webster	1,214	71	103	4	49
West Baton Rouge	376	307	828	28	14
West Carroll	333	186	4	..	25
West Feliciana	1,112	1,193	178	..	3
Winn	136	111	58	..	1,001
(Total)	79,388	47,037	29,432	12,359	9,792



*Louisiana Congressional Election Returns, November 8, 1892***First District**

Parishes	Adolph Meyer	James Wilkinson	Ross Carlin
Orleans	9,385	3,434	40
St. Bernard	560	161	12
Plaquemines	933	1,192	..
(Total)	10,878	4,787	52

**Second District**

Parishes	R. C. Davey	Morris Marks
Orleans	9,251	3,260
Jefferson	1,277	232
St. Charles	347	701
St. James	1,174	831
St. John the Baptist	539	1,078
(Total)	12,588	6,102

**Third District**

Parishes	Andrew Price	I. J. Mills	Scattering
Iberville	1,646	595	..
Assumption	1,306	696	..
Lafourche	3,067	93	..
Terrebonne	1,230	346	1
St. Mary	1,339	249	..
Iberia	588	28	..
St. Martin	483	2	..
Lafayette	664	1	..
Vermillion	323	237	..
Cameron	182	6	..
Calcasieu	1,064	692	..
Ascension	2,141	178	..
(Total)	14,033	3,123	1

**Fourth District**

Parishes	N. C. Blanchard	T. J. Guice	Scattering
Rapides	3,215	457	..
Sabine	510	760	..
De Soto	1,575	346	..
Natchitoches	1,085	594	..
Red River	953	288	..
Caddo	2,232	251	..
Bossier	2,943	72	..
Winn	201	791	..
Grant	338	500	..
Blenville	1,631	443	..
Vernon	325	369	..
Webster	1,424	296	..
(Total)	16,432	5,167	..

Fifth District				
Parishes	C. J. Boatner	A. A. Gunby	R. P. Welch	Scattering
Concordia	3,489	109	..	..
Caldwell	649	36	224	..
Franklin	516	289	25	..
Tensas	2,550	3	11	..
Madison	3,118	85	3	..
Richland	507	418	..	..
Ouachita	2,507	306	151	..
Jackson	191	209	466	..
Lincoln	445	224	1,084	..
Union	578	787	647	..
Morehouse	710	424	96	1
East Carroll	1,366	4	22	..
West Carroll	388	19	9	..
Claiborne	1,307	146	1,121	..
Catahoula	1,050	60	442	18
(Total)	19,371	3,119	4,301	19

Sixth District		
Parishes	S. M. Robertson	J. Kleinpeter
Acadia	273	96
St. Landry	1,135	899
Pointe Coupee	1,159	..
Avoyelles	1,606	3
East Feliciana	1,325	102
West Feliciana	1,563	..
East Baton Rouge	1,246	287
West Baton Rouge	1,571	30
St. Helena	304	78
Livingston	322	245
Tangipahoa	778	114
Washington	414	127
St. Tammany	62	62
(Total)	11,758	2,043

**Special Election to Fill Vacancy of N. C. Blanchard,  
Newly Elected U. S. Senator  
Fourth District**

Parishes	W. H. Ogden	C. D. Hicks	Scattering
Rapides	1,613	155	..
Sabine	153	475	..
De Soto	635	200	..
Natchitoches	702	360	..
Red River	501	135	..
Caddo	895	248	..
Bossier	1,592	70	..
Winn	139	517	..
Grant	267	440	..
Blenville	774	350	..
Vernon	219	127	2
Webster	771	256	..
(Total)	8,261	3,333	2

**Louisiana Congressional Election Returns, November 6, 1894**

**First District**

Parishes	Adolph Meyer	H. P. Kernochan	Jas. Leonard	Scattering
Orleans	12,255	3,827	370	5
Plaquemines	791	1,912	..	..
St. Bernard	359	937	..	..
(Total)	13,405	6,676	370	5

**Second District**

Parishes	Charles F. Buck	H. D. Coleman	J. M. Callaghan	Scattering
Orleans	10,351	3,556	135	3
St. James	239	1,855	..	..
St. John	522	1,019	..	..
Jefferson	3,042	333	31	..
St. Charles	710	448	..	..
(Total)	14,864	7,211	166	3

**Third District**

Parishes	Andrew Price	Taylor Beattie	John Lightner	Scattering
Cameron	238	58	41	..
Lafayette	1,117	126	..	..
Iberia	1,332	449	7	..
St. Martin	656	85	..	..
Iberville	2,935	694	..	..
Calcasieu	2,079	513	400	..
St. Mary	754	1,554	..	..
Assumption	683	1,160	..	..
Ascension	1,646	1,257	42	1
Vermillion	354	576	137	..
Lafourche	1,769	912	..	..
Terrebonne	825	1,236	14	..
(Total)	14,388	8,620	641	1



**Fourth District**

Parishes	H. W. Ogden	B. W. Bailey
Bienville	634	659
Bossier	2,705	68
Caddo	2,097	66
De Soto	996	170
Grant	176	557
Natchitoches	747	1,233
Rapides	3,097	483
Red River	726	241
Sabine	315	878
Vernon	266	443
Webster	356	319
Winn	142	815
(Total)	12,257	5,932

**Fifth District**

Parishes	C. J. Boatner	Alexis Benoit	E. M. Graham
Caldwell	467	318	..
Claiborne	938	319	..
Catahoula	589	396	..
Concordia	2,109	20	..
East Carroll	2,010	6	..
Franklin	637	420	..
Jackson	212	526	..
Lincoln	443	1,100	13
Morehouse	691	381	..
Madison	1,968	55	..
Ouachita	2,548	642	..
Tensas	1,037	..	..
Richland	663	307	..
West Carroll	443	59	..
(Total)	14,755	4,549	13

**Sixth District**

Parishes	S. M. Robertson	M. R. Wilson	Scattering
Acadia	143	93	..
Avoyelles	913	..	..
East Baton Rouge	1,405	158	..
East Feliciana	414	201	..
Livingston	228	353	..
Pointe Coupee	1,072	..	..
St. Helena	221	216	..
St. Landry	1,019	691	1
St. Tammany	416	8	..
Tangipahoa	593	167	..
West Baton Rouge	718	..	..
West Feliciana	636	25	..
Washington	203	318	..
(Total)	7,981	2,230	1

*Louisiana Gubernatorial Election, April 21, 1896*

Parishes	M. J. Foster	J. N. Pharr	A. B. Booth
Acadia	1,162	2,182	..
Ascension	1,946	1,909	..
Assumption	1,087	2,699	.
Avoyelles	2,570	1,609	..
Blenville	1,547	959	..
Bossier	3,464	58	.
Caddo	3,210	277	.
Calcasieu	2,101	3,531	79
Caldwell	376	815	..
Cameron	349	259	12
Catahoula	518	1,239	..
Clalborne	1,495	1,850	..
Concordia	3,013	80	..
De Soto	1,994	608	..
East Baton Rouge	1,470	4,859	..
East Carroll	2,635	..	..
East Feliciana	2,514	239	..
Franklin	1,093	658	..
Grant	440	1,430	..
Iberia	1,045	1,284	..
Iberville	3,092	251	..
Jackson	447	984	..
Jefferson	3,211	878	..
Lafayette	1,509	654	..
Lafourche	1,817	1,934	..
Lincoln	878	1,286	2
Livingston	579	764	..
Madison	1,803	..	..
Morehouse	1,032	385	..
Natchitoches	1,030	1,186	..
Orleans	26,330	21,683	..
Ouachita	2,337	850	..
Plaquemines	1,832	1,582	..
Pointe Coupee	2,123	1,891	..
Rapides	4,373	1,411	..
Red River	1,140	605	..
Richland	1,069	1,086	..
Sabine	934	1,033	36
St. Bernard	945	331	..
St. Charles	979	763	..
St. Helena	512	713	..
St. James	1,801	1,795	..
St. John the Baptist	1,592	787	..
St. Landry	2,557	2,656	..
St. Martin	1,339	225	..
St. Mary	1,102	3,483	..
St. Tammany	961	851	..

*Louisiana Gubernational Election, April 21, 1896—Cont.*

Parishes	M. J. Foster	J. N. Pharr	A. B. Booth
Tangipahoa	1,501	1,466	..
Tensas	1,968	..	..
Terrebonne	1,286	2,203	..
Union	1,279	1,353	40
Vermillion	760	1,906	..
Vernon	421	607	7
Washington	694	738	..
Webster	1,553	530	..
West Baton Rouge	1,461	956	..
West Carroll	362	367	..
West Feliciana	3,093	1	..
Winn	385	959	..
(Total)	116,116	87,698	176



## Louisiana Legislature, Elected April 21, 1896

## House of Representatives

Name	Nativity	Occupation	Parish	Politics
Speaker—Henry, S. P.	Pennsylvania	Planter	Cameron	Democrat
Abels, C. D.	Louisiana	Merchant	Tangipahoa	Democrat
Adolph, Fred	Louisiana	Atty. and Notary	Orleans	Ind. Democrat
Alleyn, Martin A.	Louisiana	Real Estate	Orleans	Democrat
Arial, Julius F.	Louisiana	Attorney	Rapides	Democrat
Armstrong, Johnson	Kentucky	Lawyer	Orleans	Democrat
Bailey, J. W., Jr.	Louisiana	Planter	St. Landry	Populist
Barrett, James	Louisiana	Clerk	Orleans	Democrat
Bennett, T. C.	Louisiana	Farmer	Washington	Democrat
Berthelot, Paul	Louisiana	Merchant	St. John the Baptist	Democrat
Boggs, W. B.	Alabama	Exchange Broker	Bossier	Democrat
Bolla, J. F.	Mississippi	Merchant and Planter	Madison	Democrat
Bourgeois, C. A. (A)	Louisiana	Lawyer	St. Charles	Republican
Breithaupt, Henry	Louisiana	Farmer	Catahoula	Populist
Brewster, Alex.	Louisiana	Broker	Orleans	Democrat
Brown, J. M.	North Carolina	Farmer	Natchitoches	Populist
Buford, C. A.	Louisiana	Planter	Terrebonne	Republican
Bullard, J. E.	Alabama	Farmer	Sabine	Populist
Caldwell, J. H.	Louisiana	Gln Agency	Natchitoches	Democrat
Casacalva, H. C., Jr.	Louisiana	Educator	East Baton Rouge	Republican
Chaffe, D. B. H.	Louisiana	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat
Claborn, L. B. (B)	Mississippi	Lawyer	Pointe Coupee	Democrat
Clayton, J. L.	Louisiana	Doctor	Concordia	Democrat
Cougar, Peter	Louisiana	Railroad President	Orleans	Democrat
Croom, W. H. B.	Louisiana	Merchant	Caddo	Democrat
Danaby, Patrick	Ireland	Planter	St. Landry	Populist
Delaune, M.	Louisiana	Planter	Lafourche	Democrat

Ducros, R. V. ....	Louisiana	Planter	St. Bernard	Democrat
Dudenhefer, Ferd .....	Louisiana	Clerk	Orleans	Democrat
Dufour, W. C. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat
Dugas, Honore .....	Louisiana	Planter	Assumption	Republican
Duggan, F. J. ....	Louisiana	Lawyer	Orleans	Democrat
Dupont, Alphonse .....	Louisiana	Merchant	Terrebonne	Republican
Dymond, John .....	Ohio	Planter	Plaquemine	Democrat
Fauria, Victor .....	Louisiana	Farmer	St. Tammany	Republican
Garvey, Charles .....	New York	Builder	Orleans	Ind. Democrat
Gilbert, F. B., Jr. ....	Louisiana	Mercantile	Franklin	Democrat
Gilmore, J. C. ....	Louisiana	Lawyer	Orleans	Democrat
Gunby, C. L. ....	Georgia	Farmer	Union	Populist
Glandot, August, Jr. .	Louisiana	Merchant	Orleans	Democrat
Head, W. A. ....	Georgia	Farmer	Ouachita	Democrat
Henry, S. L. ....	Virginia	Physician	Orleans	Democrat
Herbert, J. F. ....	Louisiana	Insurance Agent	Jefferson	Democrat
Hogan, I. D. ....	Alabama	Farmer	Jackson	Populist
Hudson, D. B. ....	Mississippi	Merchant	Avoyelles *	Democrat
Hyams, J. W. ....	Louisiana	Editor	West Baton Rouge	Democrat
James, D. E. ....	Louisiana	Planter	Winn	Populist
Kell, T. P. ....	Mississippi	Planter	Madison	Democrat
Kleinpeter, Josiah .....	Louisiana	Planter	East Baton Rouge	Populist
Lafargue, A. I. ....	Louisiana	Lawyer	Avoyelles	Democrat
Lange, Horatio .....	Louisiana	Stock Broker	Orleans	Democrat
LeBlanc, R. P. ....	Louisiana	Merchant	Vermilion	Independent
Littlefield, J. A. ....	Louisiana	Broker	Orleans	Democrat
Loveless, John F. ....	Louisiana	Justice of Peace	Richland	Democrat
Lyons, B. H. ....	Louisiana	Merchant	Rapides	Democrat
McIntosh, J. R. ....	Louisiana	Lawyer	West Carroll	Democrat
McClellan, O. I. ....	Louisiana	Dry Docks	Orleans	Democrat
Marks, John .....	Louisiana	Lawyer	Assumption	Democrat

## Louisiana Legislature, Elected April 21, 1896—Continued

## House of Representatives

Name	Nativity	Occupation	Parish	Politics
Meadows, S. J.	Georgia	Teacher	Clalborne	Populist
Mestier, Eugene	Louisiana	Salesman	Orleans	Democrat
Mitchell, A. R.	Texas	Lawyer	Calcasieu	Democrat
Monnot, A. L.	Louisiana	Planter	Iberia	Republican
Morey, B. J.	Rhode Island	Planter	St. Mary	Republican
Nelson, A. T.	Georgia	Farmer	Clalborne	Populist
Newton, A. E.	Mississippi	Planter	Tensas	Democrat
O'Neill, W. A.	New York City	Sugar Planter	St. Mary	Republican
Odom, J. M.	Louisiana	Merchant	St. Helena	Democrat
Parker, J. Porter	Mississippi	Lawyer	Orleans	Democrat
Perkins, E. N.	Louisiana	Planter	East Feliciana	Democrat
Peyton, W. B.	Louisiana	Broker	De Soto	Democrat
Pipes, T. W.	Louisiana	Farmer	Lincoln	Populist
Porter, W. A.	Pennsylvania	Planter	West Feliciana	Democrat
Porter, W. B.	Tennessee	Cotton Planter	East Feliciana	Democrat
Richardson, W. U.	North Carolina	Lawyer	Blenville	Democrat
St. Amant, Joseph	Louisiana	Merchant	Ascension	Democrat
Sanalin, M. H.	Louisiana	Cotton Broker	Webster	Democrat
Settoon, J. E.	Louisiana	Merchant	Livingston	Democrat
Scranton, G. W.	Louisiana	Physician	Lafayette	Ind. Democrat
Scott, W. C.	Louisiana	Teacher	De Soto	Democrat
Sharp, J. M.	Georgia	Planter	Morehouse	Democrat
Simon, James	Louisiana	Lawyer	St. Martin	Democrat
Skelly, J. D.	Louisiana	Real Estate	Orleans	Democrat
Soniet, E. J.	Louisiana	Sugar Business	Orleans	Ind. Democrat
Stewart, A. W.	Mississippi	Lumber Manufacturer	Grant	Populist
Todd, John R.	Louisiana	Merchant	Orleans	Democrat



Trezevant, Peter J. ....	South Carolina	Contractor	Caddo	Democrat
Trosclair, L. A. ....	Louisiana	Planter	Lafourche	Democrat
Truman, W. L. ....	Kentucky	Planter	St. Landry	Populist
Ventreus, W. W. ....	Louisiana	Sugar Planter	Iberville	Democrat
Wade, F. M. ....	Mississippi	Planter and Teacher	Tensas	Democrat
Waguespack, L. ....	Louisiana	Planter	St. James	Independent
Ware, James A. ....	Texas	Planter	Iberville	Democrat
Wilkinson, J. D. ....	Louisiana	Lawyer	Red River	Democrat
Williams, J. W. ....	Florida	Planter	Vernon	Populist
Wooten, C. E. ....	Louisiana	Merchant	Caldwell	Democrat
Wyly, C. S. ....	Tennessee	Lawyer	East Carroll	Democrat
Young, J. W. ....	Louisiana	Planter	Acadia	Populist
Zengel, Fred ....	Louisiana	Notary Public	Orleans	Democrat

Senate				
Name	Nativity	Occupation	Parish	Politics
Robert H. Snyder, Lieutenant-Governor. . .	Louisiana	Attorney	Tensas	Democrat
Baird, S. T. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Morehouse	Democrat
Barret, T. C. ....	Texas	Attorney	Caddo	Democrat
Batchelor, A. A. ....	Mississippi	Physician	Pointe Coupee	Democrat
Cage, H. C. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat
Cordill, C. C. ....	Mississippi	Planter	Tensas	Democrat
Cordill, S. H. ....	Louisiana	Merchant	Franklin	Democrat
Dawkins, R. B. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Union	Democrat
Denechaud, J. F. ....	Louisiana	Hotel Proprietor	Orleans	Democrat
Elliott, Clay ....	Louisiana	Attorney	St. Tammany	Democrat
Estopinal, Albert ....	Louisiana	Planter	St. Bernard	Democrat
Fenner, C. P. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat
Fisher, John D. ....	Louisiana	Manufacturer	East Baton Rouge	Democrat
Fitzpatrick, Andrew ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat

## Louisiana Legislature, Elected April 21, 1896—Continued

Senate					
Name	Nativity	Occupation	Parish	Politics	
Fuller, T. W. ....	Louisiana	Journalist	Webster	Democrat	
Howell, W. E. ....	California	Attorney	Lafourche	Republican	
LaPlace, Basil ....	Louisiana	Planter	St. John	Democrat	
Lawrason, S. McC. ....	Mississippi	Attorney	De Soto	Democrat	
Lowery, J. A. W. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Bossier	Democrat	
Martin, Robert ....	Louisiana	Attorney	St. Martin	Democrat	
Minor, H. C. ....	Mississippi	Planter	Terrebonne	Republican	
Murphy, W. M. ....	Missouri	Attorney	Madison	Democrat	
Patten, J. P. ....	Tennessee	Planter	Winn	Populist	
Romain, A. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat	
Ryan, J. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Rapides	Democrat	
Sambola, Anthony ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat	
Sholars, D. M. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Ouachita	Democrat	
Sima, R. N. ....	Louisiana	Attorney	Ascension	Democrat	
Sirjacques, W. L. ....	Louisiana	Lumber Merchant	Orleans	Democrat	
St. Paul, John ....	Alabama	Attorney	Orleans	Democrat	
Trichel, G. L. ....	Louisiana	Planter	Natchitoches	Democrat	
Watts, S. P. ....	Georgia	Attorney	Vermillion	Republican	
Webb, James ....	Louisiana	Planter	Acadia	Democrat	
Wilbert, Frederick ....	Louisiana	Manufacturer	Iberville	Democrat	
Williams, F. B. ....	Alabama	Manufacturer	St. Mary	Republican	
Wilson, M. R. ....	Georgia	Planter	St. Landry	Populist	

Louisiana Congressional Election Returns, November 3, 1896

First District					
Parishes	J. Gazin	A. E. Livaudais	A. Meyer	A. Romain	Scattering
Orleans					
3rd Ward	42	133	2,181	640	..
4th Ward	6	41	1,028	493	1
5th Ward	18	26	916	427	5
6th Ward	8	46	856	496	..
7th Ward	14	26	993	561	..
8th Ward	6	14	836	271	..
9th Ward	5	22	993	423	..
15th Ward	11	32	849	316	..
St. Bernard	2	9	570	43	..
Plaquemines	1	52	1,554	352	..
(Total)	113	401	10,776	4,022	6

Second District				
Parishes	Robert C. Davey	James Legendre	Fred N. Wicker	Scattering
Orleans				
1st Ward	1,330	417	64	..
2nd Ward	1,770	322	76	7
10th Ward	1,636	594	101	10
11th Ward	1,351	593	126	1
12th Ward	806	538	105	6
13th Ward	572	267	62	3
14th Ward	446	256	64	14
16th Ward	200	150	29	8
17th Ward	214	105	12	..
Jefferson	1,342	149	183	..
St. Charles	127	472	61	..
St. John	236	381	78	..
St. James	239	991	383	..
(Total)	10,269	5,235	1,344	49

Third District				
Parishes	Taylor Beattie	Robert F. Broussard	W. E. Gooch	H. O. Maher
Ascension	749	702	8	40
Assumption	1,079	288	24	9
Calcasieu	765	2,431	93	41
Cameron	48	233	4	2
Iberia	385	1,012	3	10
Iberville	590	355	3	4
Lafayette	223	760	15	11
Lafourche	381	1,015	9	7
St. Martin	82	675	..	..
St. Mary	336	564	14	22
Terrebonne	671	585	10	2
Vermillion	181	703	13	7
(Total)	6,490	9,323	196	155



## Fourth District

Parishes	B. W. Bailey	Robert P. Hunter	H. W. Ogden	Scattering
Bienville	468	83	824	..
Bossier	90	9	1,042	..
Caddo	170	122	1,555	..
De Soto	219	58	1,643	..
Grant	426	94	305	..
Natchitoches	740	33	849	..
Rapides	412	203	2,024	1
Red River	155	14	686	..
Sabine	658	24	656	..
Vernon	345	20	338	..
Webster	457	32	633	..
Winn	586	5	220	..
(Total)	4,726	647	10,775	1

## Fifth District

Parishes	Samuel T. Baird	Alexis Benoit	Scattering
Caldwell	249	348	..
Catahoula	434	388	..
Clalborne	950	735	..
Concordia	1,099	44	..
East Carroll	216	17	..
Franklin	683	189	..
Jackson	220	463	..
Lincoln	415	799	2
Madison	1,170	136	1
Morehouse	690	174	..
Ouachita	2,339	390	..
Richland	551	163	..
Tensas	1,245	85	..
Union	603	951	..
West Carroll	630	8	..
(Total)	11,494	4,870	3

## Sixth District

Parishes	C. C. Duzon	Sam M. Robertson	W. M. Thompson
Acadia	713	615	70
Avoyelles	145	1,767	47
East Baton Rouge	571	1,371	67
East Feliciana	21	1,451	59
Livingston	65	550	115
Pointe Coupee	326	824	10
St. Helena	64	455	32
St. Landry	466	1,296	347
St. Tammany	427	547	32
Tangipahoa	466	1,263	56
Washington	144	611	86
West Baton Rouge	244	243	6
West Feliciana	34	879	7
(Total)	3,686	11,872	924

*Louisiana Congressional Election Returns, November 8, 1898*

Parishes	First District	
	Adolph Meyer	C. W. Keeting
Orleans		
3rd Ward	822	240
4th Ward	460	153
5th Ward	751	57
6th Ward	719	134
7th Ward	418	115
8th Ward	370	58
9th Ward	461	55
15th Ward	393	50
St. Bernard	470	19
Plaquemines	558	15
(Total)	5,422	896

Parishes	Second District	
	Robert C. Davey	Frank N. Wicker
Orleans		
1st Ward	589	41
2nd Ward	777	115
10th Ward	383	37
11th Ward	459	34
12th Ward	174	35
13th Ward	200	38
14th Ward	273	27
16th Ward	155	24
17th Ward	62	13
Jefferson	1,592	190
St. Charles	1,055	28
St. John the Baptist	738	359
St. James	345	113
(Total)	6,802	1,054

Parishes	Third District	
	Robert F. Broussard	Charles Fontellieu
Ascension	497	47
Assumption	911	245
Calcasieu	738	20
Cameron	84	16
Iberia	658	157
Iberville	258	52
Lafayette	207	112
Lafourche	600	27
St. Martin	247	37
St. Mary	222	93
Terrebonne	326	19
Vermillion	180	49
(Total)	4,928	874

## Fourth District

Parishes	Phanor Breazeale	Hardy L. Brian	Scattering
Bienville	357	199	..
Bossier	441	17	..
Caddo	741	19	..
De Soto	409	33	4
Grant	126	128	3
Natchitoches	824	303	..
Rapides	713	60	..
Red River	178	66	1
Sabine	236	130	..
Vernon	205	151	..
Webster	227	150	..
Winn	67	220	..
(Total)	4,424	1,476	8

## Fifth District

Parishes	Samuel T. Baird	J. G. Taliaferro	H. B. Taliaferro	Scattering
Caldwell	106	33	19	..
Catahoula	238	196	70	1
Clalborne	313	84	5	..
Concordia	411	10	7	..
East Carroll	230	..	2	..
West Carroll	96	..	..	..
Franklin	372	80	8	..
Jackson	110	119	3	..
Lincoln	174	249	6	..
Madison	211	..	12	..
Morehouse	260	31	1	..
Ouachita	396	52	10	..
Richland	168	12	3	..
Tensas	231	..	4	..
Union	242	230	1	1
(Total)	3,558	1,096	151	2

## Sixth District

Parishes	Samuel M. Robertson	Scattering
Acadia	91	..
Avoyelles	287	..
East Baton Rouge	372	2
East Feliciana	198	..
Livingston	144	..
Pointe Coupee	177	..
St. Helena	94	..
St. Landry	419	3
St. Tammany	104	4
Tangipahoa	254	..
Washington	108	1
West Baton Rouge	152	..
West Feliciana	94	..
(Total)	2,494	10



*Louisiana Gubernatorial Election, April 17, 1900*

	Democrat	Republican	People's Party	Republican-Fusion
Parishes	W. W. Heard	Eugene S. Reems	Don Caffery, Jr.	Don Caffery, Jr.
Acadia	1,050	27	17	495
Ascension	807	104	37	799
Assumption	805	36	13	263
Avoyelles	1,376	43	63	73
Blenville	905	6	173	9
Bossier	605	3	3	3
Caddo	1,378	8	14	6
Calcasieu	2,077	114	151	112
Caldwell	368	23	139	..
Cameron	223	7	9	48
Catahoula	735	9	214	6
Claiborne	878	6	164	2
Concordia	310	39	16	..
De Soto	652	1	38	..
East Baton Rouge	819	66	10	19
East Carroll	159	1	1	6
East Feliciana	561	13	8	23
Franklin	422	6	90	29
Grant	600	6	204	15
Iberia	1,035	40	24	688
Iberville	603	15	6	221
Jackson	531	6	394	5
Jefferson	1,460	107	2	9
Lafourche	1,540	14	..	1,121
Lafayette	832	8	19	462
Livingston	511	7	91	6
Lincoln	666	7	437	11
Madison	131	2	12	5
Morehouse	435	3	16	4
Natchitoches	706	17	67	18
Orleans	18,226	888	268	2,472
Ouachita	590	8	224	13
Plaquemines	648	22	..	74
Pointe Coupee	671	17	14	..
Rapides	1,590	17	48	21
Red River	488	..	17	4
Richland	352	8	22	8
Sabine	865	5	170	..
St. Bernard	624	14	..	6
St. Charles	547	3	4	8
St. Helena	308	2	14	20
St. James	458	242	4	520
St. John	867	50	..	153
St. Landry	1,986	37	564	44
St. Martin	826	5	4	19

*Louisiana Gubernatorial Election, April 17, 1900—Continued*

	Democrat	Republican	People's Party	Republican-Fusion
Parishes	W. W. Heard	Eugene S. Reams	Don Caffery, Jr.	Don Caffery, Jr.
St. Mary	1,008	22	7	557
St. Tammany	601	105	23	51
Tangipahoa	473	24	33	44
Tensas	235	1	..	..
Terrebonne	1,173	8	8	648
Union	808	5	256	..
Vermillion	328	145	22	81
Vernon	683	35	342	23
Washington	327	20	15	8
Webster	670	6	51	18
West Baton Rouge	282	3	1	27
West Carroll	100	..	11	..
West Feliciana	276	3	8	..
Winn	516	10	376	..
(Total)	60,206	2,449	4,938	9,277

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES

*Federal Government Publications*

*Congressional Record*, 51 Congress, 2 Session, 158.

Thorpe, Francis N. (comp.), *Federal and State Constitutions . . . and Other Organic Laws . . . the United States . . . 7 vols.*, Washington, 1909.

*United States Census Reports, Population, Agriculture, Industry*. Washington, 1890-1900 (Eleventh and Twelfth).

*State Government Publications*

*Acts of Louisiana*, 1890-1898.

*Louisiana State Constitutions*, 1879, 1898.

*Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1898* (New Orleans, 1898).

*Biennial Reports of the Secretary of State of the State of Louisiana to the General Assembly*, 1888-1898.

*Report of the Secretary of State to His Excellency W. W. Heard, Governor of the State of Louisiana* (Baton Rouge, 1902).

*Biennial Reports of the Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Louisiana*, 1888-1898.

*Newspapers*

- Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), 1892, 1896.  
*Louisiana Populist* (Natchitoches), August 24, 1894-March 10, 1899.  
*Natchitoches Enterprise*, July 25, August 8, 1889; May 20, 1890.  
*Opelousas Courier*, 1892.  
*Ouachita Telegraph* (Monroe), 1887-1890.  
*St. Landry Clarion* (Opelousas), March 7, 1891.  
*Times-Democrat* (New Orleans), 1888-1900.  
*Winn Parish Democrat* (Winnfield), March 1, 8, 15, October 25, 1889; April 25, 1890.

SECONDARY SOURCES

*General American Histories*

- Beard, Charles A. and Mary R., *The Rise of American Civilization*, 2 vols. (New York, 1930).  
McMaster, John B., *History of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War*, 8 vols. (New York, 1883-1913).  
Rhodes, James Ford, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850 to the End of the Roosevelt Administration*, 9 vols. (New York, 1928).

*State Histories*

- Chambers, Henry E., *A History of Louisiana*, 3 vols. (New York, 1925), I.  
Fortier, Alcée, *A History of Louisiana*, 4 vols. (New York, 1904), IV.

*Books of General and Local Interest*

- Arnett, Alex Mathews, *The Populist Movement in Georgia*. Columbia University, New York, 1922.  
Beard, Charles A., *American Government and Politics*. Macmillan Company, New York, 1931.  
Brooks, Robert Preston, *Agrarian Revolution in Georgia, 1865-1912*. Madison, Wisconsin, 1914.  
Buck, Solon J., *Agrarian Crusade*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1921.  
Ficklen, John R., *History of Reconstruction in Louisiana, through 1868*. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1910.  
Fleming, Walter L., *Sequel of Appomattox*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1919.



- Hammond, M. B., *Cotton Industry*. Macmillan Company, New York, 1901.
- Harris, Joel Chandler, *Life of Henry W. Grady*. Cassell Publishing Company, New York, 1890.
- Hicks, John D., *Populist Revolt*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1931.
- Holcombe, Arthur N., *The Political Parties of Today*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1924.
- Latané, John Holladay, *America as a World Power, 1897-1907*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1907.
- Lewinson, Paul, *Race, Class, and Party*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1932.
- Lonn, Ella, *Reconstruction in Louisiana, after 1868*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1918.
- McDonald, William, *Documentary Source Book of American History*. Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.
- McKee, Thomas A., *National Conventions and Platforms of All Political Parties, 1789 to 1905*. Friedenwald Company, Baltimore, 1906.
- Nevins, Allan, *The Emergence of Modern America, 1865-1876*. Macmillan Company, New York, 1928.
- Paxson, Frederic L., *History of the American Frontier, 1763-1893*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1924.
- Paxson, Frederic L., *Recent History of the United States*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1928.
- Reynolds, George M., *Machine Politics in New Orleans 1897-1926*. Columbia University Press, New York, 1936.
- Schlesinger, Arthur M., *The Rise of the City (1878-1898)*. Macmillan Company, New York, 1933.
- Simkins, Francis B., *The Tillman Movement in South Carolina*. Duke University Press, Durham, 1926.
- Stanwood, Edward, *A History of the Presidency*. 2 vols. Houghton Mifflin and Company, Boston, 1912.
- Sullivan, Mark, *Our Times, the United States, 1900-1925*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1926-1935.
- Taussig, Frank W., *Tariff History of United States*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1931.
- Turner, Frederick Jackson, *The Frontier in American History*. Henry Holt and Company, New York, 1921.
- Warmoth, Henry C., *War, Politics and Reconstruction: Stormy Days in Louisiana*. Macmillan Company, New York, 1930.

*Almanacs and Encyclopedias*

*Appleton's Annual Cyclopedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1890.* New York, 1891.

*Harper's Encyclopedia of United States History.* Harper and Brothers, New York.

*World Almanac, 1892-1900.*

*Monographs*

Alwes, Berthold C., "The History of the Louisiana Lottery Company." Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1929.

Barnhart, John D., "History of the Farmers' Alliance and of the People's Party in Nebraska." Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1929.

Caffery, Mrs. Lucille Roy, "The Political Career of Senator Donelson Caffery." Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1935.

McCain, William David, "The Populist Party in Mississippi." Master's thesis, University of Mississippi, 1931.

Wiggins, Richard H., "The Louisiana Press and the Lottery." Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1936.

Willis, Cufley Daniel, "Granger Movement in Louisiana." Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1935.

*Articles*

Barnhart, John D., "Rainfall and the Populist Party in Nebraska," *American Political Science Review* (Baltimore, 1907- ), XIX (1925), 527-540.

Farmer, Hallie M., "The Economic Background of Frontier Populism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), X (1923-1924), 406-427.

Farmer, Hallie M., "The Economic Background of Southern Populism," *South Atlantic Quarterly* (Durham, 1902- ), XXIX (1930), 77-91.

Farmer, Hallie M., "The Railroads and Frontier Populism," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XIII (1926-1927), 387-397.

Hicks, John D., "The Origin and Early History of the Farmers' Alliance in Minnesota," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), IX (1922-1923), 203-226.

Hicks, John D., "The Sub-treasury; a Forgotten Plan for the Relief of Agriculture," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XV (1928-1929), 355-373.

- Hicks, John D., "Third Party Tradition in American Politics," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XX (1933-1934), 3-28.
- Martin, Roscoe C., "The People's Party in Texas," *The University of Texas Bulletin*, No. 3308, February 22, 1933, pp. 1-280.
- McGinty, G. W., "Changes in Louisiana Agriculture," *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917, ), XVIII (1935), 407-429.
- McGrane, R. C., "Ohio and the Greenback Movement," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XI (1924-1925), 526-542.
- Miller, Raymond Curtis, "The Background of Populism in Kansas," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XI (1924-1925), 469-489.
- Nixon, Herman Clarence, "The Cleavage Within the Farmers' Alliance Movement," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), XV (1928-1929), 22-23.
- Violette, E. M., "Donelson Caffery—a Louisiana Democrat out of Line," *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917- ), XIV (1931), 521-532.
- White, Melvin J., "Populism in Louisiana During the Nineties," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ), V (1918-1919), 3-19.

#### *Autobiographies, Biographies and Memoirs*

- Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Louisiana . . . 2 vols.* Goodspeed Publishing Company, Chicago, 1892.
- Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Northwest Louisiana.* Southern Publishing Company, Nashville, 1890.
- Croly, Herbert D., *Marcus Alonza Hanna; His Life and Work.* Macmillan Company, New York, 1912.
- Long, John C., *Bryan, the Great Commoner.* D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1928.
- Roosevelt, Theodore, *Autobiography.* Macmillan Company, 1913.

#### *Pamphlets*

- Speech of Honorable Murphy J. Foster (Senior Senator of Louisiana). Opening His Campaign for Re-election.* The Athenaeum, New Orleans, Tuesday, October 3, 1911. Foster Campaign Committee, Allied Printing, New Orleans.
- "*The Citizens' League.*" *A History of the Great Reform Movement in New Orleans, April 21, 1896. With Biographical Sketches of those who took a prominent part in the Movement.* Compiled by J. J. McGinty. Published by S. W. Taylor. Printed by Theo. A. Ray, New Orleans.



*Magazines and Periodicals*

- Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935- ).  
*Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917- ).  
*Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914- ).  
*Review of Reviews*, XXI, June, 1900, pp. 647-649.  
*Review of Reviews*, XXXVIII, September, 1908, pp. 303-306.  
*Historical Outlook*, XXIII, 153-163.  
*Outlook*, LXV, May 16, 1900, pp. 141-142.  
*Forum*, XXVIII, February, 1900, pp. 658-662.  
*American Historical Review*, October, 1920, pp. 147-148.

## JOSEPH JEFFERSON IN NEW ORLEANS

---

By JOHN SMITH KENDALL

---

High up on the facade of the St. Charles Theater, so lost in other architectural embellishments as to escape the notice of nine out of ten passers-by who, for one reason or another, glance in that direction, is a small, circular medallion on which is carved the profile of an elderly gentleman with a prodigious nose. The original of whom that medallion is an unflattering portrait was for many years familiar to New Orleans theatergoers—and, indeed, to many persons in Southern Louisiana who never set foot inside of a New Orleans place of amusement. That original was Joseph Jefferson, in his day the best-known comedian on the American stage; although his name has lost almost all meaning for the present generation. Famous today—forgotten tomorrow—such, alas! is the penalty of theatrical success. Jefferson has fared better than most, if not all, of his professional contemporaries: he has at least one monument to perpetuate his memory, howbeit a very small one.

New Orleans has a right to put the portrait of Joseph Jefferson on the wall of its oldest surviving theater. For the great comedian was identified in some intimate ways and over a considerable period of time with this city and with the state in which this city stands. According to his own confession, it was in New Orleans that he felt the first stirrings of an ambition which carried him eventually to a foremost place in his delightful art. Here, on various occasions, he filled engagements at our theaters. Here, too, for one season he figured as a member of the famous St. Charles stock company. Moreover, he bought a plantation in the southern part of Louisiana, and in going to and from that place, as he did annually for the better part of a generation, he had to pass through New Orleans. On such visits he often lingered to see old friends and to revive the associations of his youthful days in the old town. All of which adds up to a large part of the nomadic life of an actor—even of a great one.

Jefferson first saw New Orleans when he was thirteen years of age. That was in 1842. He was brought to the city by his

parents, who were on their way to appear at the theater in Mobile; for they, too, were actors. The little family came down the Mississippi on a river steamboat. They travelled in the "steerage"—that is, as deck passengers—and must have spent only a few days in the busy Southern capital. There is no record of any connection with the local theaters at that time, although Joseph, in spite of his tender years, had already had considerable stage experience. His next visit to New Orleans was during the season of 1844-45, when he and his brother and sister had a short engagement at the St. Charles Theater. They opened there in November, 1844, and danced a "polka" between the acts of the tragedies acted by Junius Brutus Booth—surely an incongruous program, if ever there was such!—but Ludlow & Smith, under whose management the theater then was, believed in giving the public what it wanted, even if what it wanted was in questionable taste.

It was during the ensuing year that Jefferson became a member of the stock company at the St. Charles. We know regrettably little about his work in this capacity. The newspapers were silent regarding his performances. In fact, the only reference that we have to Jefferson at this point in his career is a memorandum in the management's account book, crediting him with the payment of a fine for "boisterous and noisy" behavior in his dressing room—conduct which was probably not so reprehensible as it sounds, when we remember that the offender was not yet eighteen years of age. During the season he was called on to act with Mr. and Mrs. Charles Kean, Mrs. Mowett, J. H. Hackett, and other notable "stars." He could not have been wholly unacceptable, even to these exacting visitors. At any rate, he acquitted himself sufficiently to the satisfaction of Ludlow & Smith for them to give him an opportunity to play at their theater in St. Louis, during the following season.

Jefferson's next visit to New Orleans was the most important event in his life. It was here and then that, in a very real sense, his career began. He tells about it in his charming autobiography. Speaking of the value of newspaper criticism to an actor, he goes on to relate instances where men of undoubted histrionic talent have incurred the enmity of some journalist or other, and repented it ever after. The first time this truth was borne in on his consciousness was in New Orleans. He



had just arrived in a sailing vessel—"a brig"—from a trip to Mexico, where our war with that country was in progress. He writes:

The brig had scarcely touched the wharf when I leaped ashore and bought a morning paper to see what theaters were open. At the St. Charles, still under the management of Ludlow & Smith, there was announced the "Tragedy of King Richard III," from the original text, the stars being Mr. and Mrs. James W. Wallack, Jr., who appeared as the Duke of Gloster and Queen Elizabeth, the evening's entertainment concluding with the farce of "A Kiss in the Dark," with the then rising young comedian, John E. Owens, as Mr. Pettibone. Of course I went to the theater. As I had acted there the season before, I knew all the attachés and most of the company, and I naturally expected to be something of a lion, having just returned from the seat of war [our war with Mexico was then in progress]. In this, however, I was somewhat disappointed, for I had arrived on a sailing vessel, and they knew more of the conflict than I did.

That night I saw the performance. . . . My chief interest on this occasion was centered in the farce—and why not? Was I not a rising young comedian myself? I certainly had reached that height in my own estimation, at least, and I felt a burning desire that a time should come when some newspaper would proclaim it for me, as the New Orleans Picayune had that day announced it for Owens.

At last Owens came, and certainly he conquered. As he entered briskly upon the stage, humming a sprightly song, I thought him the handsomest low comedian I had ever seen. He had a neat, dapper little figure and a face full of lively expression. His audience was with him from first to last, his effective style and great flow of animal spirits capturing them and myself, too—though I must confess that I had a hard struggle even inwardly to acknowledge it.

As I look back and call to mind the slight twist of envy that I felt that night, I am afraid that I had hoped to see something not quite so good, and was a little amazed to find him such a capital actor; in short, I experienced those unpleasant twinges of jealousy that will creep over us in those moments when we are not at our best—though these feelings may occasionally produce a good result. In me, I know, it stirred up the first great ambition that I remember ever to have felt, and from that night of pleasure and excitement, I resolved to equal Owens some day, if I could.

At that time New Orleans was one of the most important theatrical centers in the United States. The St. Charles was not the only English-language theater in the city. They were,

in fact, so many that the resultant competition reacted unfavorably on more than one, and on more than one occasion. This had just happened to the American Theater, perhaps the most persistent rival with which the St. Charles had to contend. The American was under the management of James Place. He had just been forced by financial reverses to close the doors of his establishment. The actors who had thus been released were still in the city. After the inmemorial custom of the profession, they haunted the theaters which were still in operation. Thus it happened that, on the night described by Jefferson, he was not the only Thespian in the audience at the St. Charles. Most of the people from the American were also present.

"War," says Jefferson in his autobiography, "usually increases the nightly receipts of the theater," but the campaign in Mexico, in which New Orleans had a vital interest, and which kept its streets thronged with men in uniform, does not seem to have had that effect. Only a small contingent of laymen was present that night at the St. Charles. The number of actors on hand just about equaled that of the general public. Perhaps the entertainment did not, on the whole, justify a larger audience. The principals were admirable, as Jefferson records, but the play was indifferently mounted and the subordinate rôles were inadequately cast. The armies of York and Lancaster, for instance, consisted of half-a-dozen wretchedly equipped supers, and the awkward way in which they manoeuvred, even in the final thrilling moments of that great play, was not calculated to awaken any enthusiasm among the spectators, especially the critical professional portion of them.

A good many years were to elapse before Joseph Jefferson saw the Crescent City again. In the interim he paid a visit to Australia, during which for the first time he was seen in a dramatization of Washington Irving's story, "Rip Van Winkle." With this work much of Jefferson's great reputation is identified. The version which he used in Australia was his own composition. It was not the first time that Irving's work had been utilized for the purposes of the stage. New Orleans was familiar with a play on the subject which the elder Hackett revamped from an English original, and produced in 1831. There were also arrangements by Kerr, which J. H. Newbury long retained in his repertory; by Flynn, played by him in

1833; and still another by Jefferson's half-brother, Charles Burke, who was applauded in it in 1850. No doubt Jefferson was influenced in writing his own dramatization by what he recollected of Burke's production. Anyhow, the Australians did not think much of his effort. Jefferson himself was conscious of its shortcomings. In 1865, when he was in London, he induced Dion Boucicault to revise it. That skilful craftsman did his usually expert job. In this final form "Rip Van Winkle" was brought out at one of the theaters in the British metropolis, where it ran one hundred and seventy nights with the unstinted approbation of the public.

"Rip Van Winkle," as thus written, revised, corrected and improved, was first given by Jefferson in New Orleans at the Varieties Theater on January 10, 1870. It was one of various plays given in the course of a two-weeks' engagement. It was sandwiched in between "Our American Cousin," in which he took the rôle of Asa Trenchard; the burlesque "Mazeppa;" "Lend Me Five Shillings," in which he had one of his favorite parts, that of Golightly; and "The Specter Bridegroom." Jefferson was supported by Floyd and Owens, the latter no less a person than the actor who had so excited his admiration a quarter-century previously. The public did not respond very cordially on this occasion, but when the already famous comedian returned to New Orleans, two years later, with the same repertory, he was warmly welcomed. The newspapers frankly said that on the previous visit he had taken no pains to act well, whereas now, apparently, he did; hence, the more flattering reception.

During this engagement "Rip Van Winkle" was given several times. It was first performed on January 13, 1872, with Augusta Dargon as Dame Van Winkle, George Ryer as Derrick, Frank Murdock as Hendrick Vedder, and Miss F. Murdock as Meenie—all names of importance in the theater of that day. Some of the success of the production was attributed to the scenery, which was unusually beautiful. As a rule in those jejune days the peripatetic companies relied on the local theaters for scenery, and the results were sometimes inappropriate, and occasionally ludicrous. Jefferson, however, brought his scenery with him. It had been painted expressly for "Rip" by the then well-known theatrical artist, Piggott, and included quite elaborate mountings for each of the three acts into which Boucicault had divided the play.



Then, down to the date when his son, Charles B. Jefferson, in partnership with Mark Klaw and that other New Orleans theatrical luminary, Abraham Erlanger, took over the management of the St. Charles Theater, the comedian did not revisit New Orleans professionally. He returned in 1893. During the five following years, Jefferson played there regularly every season, always featuring "Rip," although he gave other plays, also, like "The Rivals" and "The Heir at Law." I liked him better in the two last named works than I did in his more celebrated part.

By 1899 Charles B. Jefferson had dropped out of the firm of Jefferson, Klaw & Erlanger. The two last named individuals retained the business. In the year named, they vacated the St. Charles in favor of their own theaters on Baronne Street, near Common. Joseph Jefferson followed them to the new houses—or, rather, to one of the new houses, the commodious but unbeautiful Tulane Theater. Under the Klaw & Erlanger aegis he filled three successive engagements at this establishment. He played a two weeks' engagement there during the season of 1899-1900, following Viola Allen and preceding Richard Mansfield. Jefferson closed the season at the Tulane in 1903, and the following year he was the last attraction on the Tulane list, except that veteran trouper, Marie Cahill.

In 1899, when Jefferson paid the first of his three visits to the Tulane, he was at the head of an organization called the Jefferson Comedy Company. This was probably the finest assemblage of talent ever brought together in the United States for the presentation of the classic English comic masterpieces. The plays which were given included "The Rivals," with Jefferson as Bob Acres, and "The Heir at Law," with him as Dr. Pangloss, two rôles in which he was unequalled. He was supported by Mrs. John Dr w, then a septuagenarian, but still a consummate mistress of her art; Jack Barnes, an accomplished actor who, somehow, missed the recognition to which I thought his splendid talent entitled him; and by Louis James, one of the most gifted and most versatile actors who have ever adorned the American stage. To see these people together in "The Rivals" was to enjoy one of the choicest experiences of a lifetime. Unfortunately, this brilliant group did not survive the season. When the theatrical year came to an end, its members departed, to take places in other organizations.

I recall with particular pleasure Jefferson's performance in "The Rivals." Before his time Bob Acres had been played as a crude country bumpkin. In Jefferson's hands the rôle was invested with a tenderness, a sympathy and a human quality that lifted it to the level of the great comic masterpieces. In the duel scene Jefferson achieved one of the most difficult feats which an actor can attempt. He came on the stage, walked down to the footlights, and stood there for some minutes in perfect silence, looking out at the audience with eyes in which stark terror and dumb misery contended for mastery. Jefferson was a small man, physically, but at that moment, he seemed twice his normal height and half his normal thickness. In this way he emphasized Bob's hope to present as small a target as possible to his adversary's bullet. The scene is rich in comedy, but Jefferson, without slighting its risible implications, managed to convey to the audience all the conflicting emotions with which he contemplated the impending battle. It was a triumph of pantomime—or perhaps of something higher and more subtle than pantomime. The audience was at first moved to laughter, but as Jefferson stood there, looking at us with eyes which seemed preternaturally large and fathomless in their wretchedness and despair, the mood of mirth declined, and in its place was heard something almost like a sob of sympathy and understanding. Then came the applause, with which the theater rocked for many minutes. I doubt if the great actor ever rose to a loftier pinnacle of achievement in the art of which he was so notable an exponent, than he did in that particular moment.

However infrequently he may have come to New Orleans in a professional capacity, Joseph Jefferson came often for other, purely personal, reasons. As I have already intimated, through this city lay the most convenient route to his estate at Orange Island, later to be called Jefferson Island. He acquired this property in 1871, and owned it down to his death in 1905. Originally it comprised only a thousand acres, but it was enlarged from time to time, until it embraced the entire island of about 9000 acres. About 3000 acres were kept in cultivation to rice and sugar. At first the place was accessible from New Iberia only by a dirt road. In good weather this afforded a delightful drive, but in bad weather it was very much the reverse. There were times when the estate was quite isolated, due to the difficulties of transportation. From the point where the road entered

his property, Jefferson had it bordered with cherokee roses. He superintended the planting of these shrubs, and set out a considerable part of them himself. Later on, the Southern Pacific Railroad built a branch line that touched the lower boundary of the plantation, and opened a small station there, known as Bob Acres. That made life on the Island much more enjoyable, and facilitated the coming and going of the guests whom the genial proprietor delighted to have partake of his hospitality.

The Orange Island estate was surrounded by a fence, or hedge, seven miles in length. This, too, was composed of cherokee roses so thick that not even small animals could penetrate it anywhere except where the road crossed. There was also an inner inclosure, defended by a similar hedge three miles in circumference. The outer area was given over to a herd of cattle numbering several hundred head. At virtually the center of the estate Jefferson erected a comfortable wooden house, and, near at hand, a smaller building which accommodated members of the actor's family, when they visited the place. The mansion—for such it was—stood on a small hill about seventy feet high, overlooking the salt marshes along Vermilion Bay. From the belvedere on the roof a glimpse might be obtained of the distant Gulf of Mexico. It was a great, rambling, hospitable structure, one story high, with verandahs on three sides trellised with roses. A central hall twelve feet wide traversed the building, and led into the dining room at the rear, where there was an immense fireplace capable of accommodating a five-foot log. The walls of the hall were adorned with trophies of the gun and rod, with both of which Jefferson and his sons were exceptionally proficient.

From the mansion back to a little lake which lay at a distance in the rear, stretched a magnificent row of live oaks. These trees were reputed to be over a hundred years old. Jefferson never wearied of admiring them. It was chiefly on their account that he selected the site for his home. The spot was said to have been occupied originally by the residence of Jean Laffite, and the trees were planted by the pirate—or so Jefferson professed to believe. However, all traces of Laffite's building disappeared long before Jefferson's arrival at Orange Island. It may be doubted if the celebrated buccaneer ever really lived thereabouts, but the tradition of his presence lent a certain glamor to the vicinity, and Jefferson liked to remind his guests of the story.



The plantation at Orange Island was seldom without guests. One of the most distinguished visitors was Ex-President Grover Cleveland. Jefferson had a pet joke which he liked to work off on newcomers. That was, to get them to sample a sour orange. As many of his guests were from the northern part of the United States where sour oranges—or sweet ones, for that matter—are unknown, these were the chief victims of the pleasantry. Jefferson derived a good deal of amusement from watching their eager anticipation of a delicious mouthful, change abruptly to disgust and disappointment.

At Orange Island the principal amusements were hunting and fishing. The hunting preserves covered 3000 acres, and were regarded as among the finest in the country. At one time Jefferson was an enthusiastic hunter, but during his last years at the Island he lost all taste for this sport. To the end, however, the gun-room remained the favorite part of the house. When in residence Jefferson spent many mornings on the verandah of the mansion, in a big wicker armchair. Most of his autobiography—one of the classics of theatrical literature—was written there. When not so occupied, Jefferson was fond of taking long walks through the woods.

After he gave up hunting, Jefferson spent more and more time with his paints and brushes; for he was a landscape painter of more than average ability. In fact, at Orange Island, he strove to divest himself of every attribute which could identify himself with the stage. He wished to figure there merely as a man of leisure. It is probable that only a handful of people living in the vicinity of his estate were aware that their neighbor had any special claims to distinction. To practically all of them, he was just a kindly, rather eccentric old fellow, with an unaccountable interest in the "homespun" fabrics which they manufactured in their homes on handlooms. The artistic quality of this material appealed to Jefferson, and he took a good deal of trouble to make it known to the public. Even the Negroes on Orange Island were aware only that the "boss" did "sumpin' er ruther" when absent from the place, but were delightfully vague about its nature.

Eventually a too-enterprising geologist ascertained that Orange Island was, in reality, a "salt dome"—one of those extraordinary formations which are found in the marshes of Southern Louisiana, where a high grade of rock salt can be

mined in inexhaustible quantities. Jefferson was quite skeptical about the presence of the mineral on his property. Nevertheless, he made a contract with a company which desired to exploit the alleged salt deposits. When success crowned its efforts, he knew how to extract a handsome profit from the mine which was promptly opened up; but the intrusion of workingmen and machinery destroyed the sylvan charm which constituted for Jefferson the chief attraction of Orange Island, and he lost interest in the place, finally ceasing altogether to visit it. After the property was sold, the mansion which had been the scene of so many interesting and enjoyable reunions became the residence of the local representative of the new owners of the Island. At the present time, no one who ventures into Orange Island—now yclept Jefferson Island—and who remembers it as it was in other days, will recognize the place; and no one who did not see it when Jefferson lived there, can form any idea of its original beauty and charm.

My own recollections of Joseph Jefferson are limited to the latter part of his career. They began in 1893. I was then a reporter on one of the New Orleans newspapers. I was sent to the St. Charles Theater, where Jefferson was then playing, to obtain an interview. There was no special reason why we should print an interview at that moment. My city editor, however, thought that a talk with the veteran actor would interest some of our readers. Jefferson was giving "The Rivals" that night. "I can't talk for publication," he said, rather petulantly, "but if you will write out a list of questions, I will try to answer them, and you can print that!" Which was, of course, entirely satisfactory to me.

Our brief conversation occurred in the wings, just before Jefferson "went on" for the excruciatingly funny challenge scene. I managed to compose my list of questions while he was on the stage. As he came off, I handed the paper to him. "Good!" he exclaimed. "Now come to our dressing room, and we will see about the answers."

He had in his hand the quill pen which he had been using on the stage. It was with this implement that he scribbled down the notes which I published in the *Picayune* the following morning. When he completed the task, I asked him to give me the pen. By this time he had written himself into a high good humor, and

not only acceded cheerfully to my request, but on another sheet of paper dashed off his characteristically flamboyant signature, which he also handed me. I have the notes and the autograph yet, but the quill—alas, after being treasured for many years, it was lost!

At that time and for some years subsequently, Jefferson was much in request in New Orleans for lectures. He liked to give a lecture which he had composed on the art of the actor. He must have delivered it ten or fifteen times in the various New Orleans clubs and schools. I reported it repeatedly for the *Picayune*. The first time I heard it, I was delighted with the wit and eloquence of the old gentleman. It seemed the most spontaneous and delightful of intimate discourses—a virtually heart-to-heart chat between him and his audience concerning the art of which he was admittedly the greatest living master. But when I had heard the lecture five or six times, and found that it never varied in word, gesture, intonation or sentiment, I was driven to conclude that it was, after all, just another of Jefferson's wonderful professional accomplishments. In that spirit I wrote what I thought was a most complimentary notice, explaining that it was as notable a bit of acting as any that New Orleans had ever seen.

But the old gentleman was highly displeased. The following afternoon he stormed into my office at the *Picayune*, and took me roundly to task. "You've spoiled the whole thing!" he cried. "Now you have let the cat out of the bag, nobody will want to hear me again. And I took a lot of pains with that lecture to make it sound like an offhand, impromptu effort! How am I going to make people believe I am a clever speaker now? What did you write that stuff for, anyway?"

I explained as well as I could, but it was months before Jefferson was pacified. I do not think he ever altogether forgave me. When he arrived in the city a year later, he came in to see me, and asked if I was going to report his lecture this time, and, if so, to do it—as he said, half-humorously and half-seriously—"so as to give a fellow a chance!" Thereafter he dropped in occasionally, but the subject was never revived; whence I inferred that the subsequent notices that I printed regarding his lectures in New Orleans met with his approval—a rather grudging approval, no doubt—but, I hope, approval.



Off the stage Joseph Jefferson was always interesting and singularly attractive. His customary forms of address were distinguished by a great sincerity, and somewhat disarming candor. If he liked a person, he did not hesitate to tell him; and if otherwise, he was equally frank. He was scrupulously truthful, and expected a corresponding veracity in those with whom he came in contact. With his own art, he was almost exaggeratedly conscientious. When the public showed its approbation of any particular features of his work, he was careful to give it that way thereafter. He used to say that his audiences were his guests, and that courtesy demanded that their wishes should be deferred to.

Although he had no formal education whatever, Jefferson was a man of unusual culture. He had read and thought much regarding the history of the theater. It is an interesting fact that, although he never acted any of the great Shakespearian rôles, he was a lifelong student of the English poet. He told me once that he intended to write a book on Shakespeare. It is to be regretted that he never carried out this plan. A volume of the sort would have been of prime value, not only to other students of the Bard, but as exhibiting a side of Jefferson's mentality which is only imperfectly reflected in his autobiography.

Jefferson was probably the wealthiest actor of his epoch. He was very canny in money matters. From the hour when he began to earn more than a bare pittance, he saved a part of his income. He never speculated, and his investments were all well-considered and uniformly profitable. Long before his death he was rated a millionaire. Prudent always to excess in the management of his financial affairs, he nevertheless cultivated a generosity which, though impulsive and unsystematic, was genuine and far-reaching. He kept his numerous charitable deeds to himself, realizing that, should they become known, he would be plagued beyond endurance by the solicitations of the unscrupulous needy.

By way of illustrating Jefferson's prompt and generous response when he felt that his intervention was justified, let me quote here an anecdote which was published in one of the New Orleans newspapers at the time of his death:

Not many years ago an aged resident of Washington, poor at the time, but previously prosperous and even wealthy, and through all the vicissitudes of fortune universally re-

spected, sat one winter evening by the light of a candle in a small and somewhat cheerless room, examining and arranging the papers contained in his antique desk. A young friend kept him company. The old gentleman's venerable dog was also present, sleeping on the hearth before the low wood fire. Paper after paper was drawn from the dusty pigeon holes and quaint recesses of the desk, with some brief remark concerning each, and now and then some pleasant, or pathetic little anecdote. That night the old man was living over his past life, all of its color and animation seemingly restored by the magical contact with faded notes and letters.

"Here's one from Joseph Jefferson," he said. "Dear old Joe! He was the best friend I ever had! Let me see"—holding up the candle to aid his sight and readjusting his spectacles—"Yes! The money I lent him once, in his theatrical trouble—"

"Is that the famous actor who died so many years ago?"

"The same."

"And the Joe Jefferson who is now living?"

"The grandson of my friend."

"I have of course never seen the earlier Joe Jefferson, but the actor who now bears that name is one of my favorites. I have seen him in 'Rip Van Winkle,' and that is a wonderful performance. That letter is a precious souvenir of the family to which the later Joe belongs. Would you give it to me?"

"Certainly. It is interesting and valuable as the autograph of a great genius—a man who was not only a fine actor but a noble character. His debt to me—I know he would have paid it, had not misfortune overtaken him, and then he died. He passed away before he could recover his financial footing. That was forty-one years ago—the very month in which this letter was written."

A week passed. Again the young man was with the old gentleman. He brought him a letter—a letter from the grandson of his quondam friend, alluding to the long-forgotten debt, expressing warm gratitude and enclosing a check for the sum due, with interest. That amount, carefully employed, rendered the old man comfortable for the remainder of his days.

Jefferson was particularly open to requests for aid from members of his own profession. Many anecdotes might be given here to illustrate this point. I have room for only one, drawn from the source of which I have already availed myself:

No deserving member of his calling when in distress ever appealed to Mr. Jefferson in vain, and he has always

been prompt to relieve suffering wherever found. Not long ago he kept from poverty a clergyman who had bitterly denounced him from the pulpit. When in poverty, sickness and want, this divine was found, fed and clothed by the man he had so unjustly attacked. Could there be a more striking proof than this of the largeness and sweet catholicity of the nature of Joseph Jefferson?

Nevertheless, it is a curious fact that in the management of his theatrical affairs Jefferson exhibited a conservatism which some uncharitable persons did not hesitate to qualify as penuriousness. Except for "Rip Van Winkle" I have never heard of his having produced a new play. Otherwise, he always acted in old plays on which he had to pay no royalties. No beginning dramatist could ever look back to any encouragement received from Joseph Jefferson that involved the expenditure of cash. I think, however, there were explanations which make Jefferson's position in this connection understandable—perhaps even excusable. The bad results of his Australian venture with the primitive version of "Rip" undoubtedly prejudiced him against novelties on the stage. His caution in money matters probably deterred him also from embarking in so uncertain a venture as a new play, the large sums which even the least pretentious theatrical enterprise always entails. Moreover, there was in the great actor's psychology a curiously timid streak; he dreaded undertaking a rôle which he had not seen interpreted by some previous player. His method was to refine and develop such interpretations, and so attain perfection, but he did not have sufficient confidence in his own talent to attempt to build up a totally original impersonation. Like many artists both on the stage and elsewhere, he needed the stimulus of competition. His imagination was aroused only by way of reaction to something which he could review, criticise, and correct.

One of the most intriguing phases of Jefferson's complex character was his religious bent. He never affiliated with any of the established churches, but had, nevertheless, a deep interest in all that they stood for. On one occasion, when our conversation veered around to this subject, Jefferson told me that he was "a kind of spiritualist." He professed to believe that he was guided by a guardian spirit. He thought that he received communications from this spirit, and attributed to its influence no small part of his professional success. His relationship to this supernatural protector is illustrated in an incident, which according



to an apparently well-authenticated story, occurred one summer at Orange Island. Jefferson was busy one day at his easel in his workroom at Orange Island, when he suddenly looked up, listened, and then rushed away, exclaiming, "Charley is in trouble!" Charley, of course, was his son. Charley had gone out in a row-boat to fish, had met with an accident, and might have been drowned but for the timely arrival of the rescuers headed by his father.

In some reminiscences contributed to one of the New Orleans newspapers by General Fred F. Miles, a once-widely-known Louisiana planter, who was one of Jefferson's intimate friends, I find a remarkable anecdote which may appropriately be reproduced here. General Miles was a frequent guest at Jefferson's home at Buzzards' Bay, and it was during a visit there that Jefferson told him the story. I quote:

It seems he was feeling ill and despondent when he came to a certain town, and did not know whether he could play that night, or not. So while he was debating with himself in his room at the hotel, the door opened and a man of singular appearance entered. He told Jefferson that if he would go to a certain drugstore several doors down the street from his lodgings, and order pills to be compounded of certain medicines which were named, and take two pills twice a day, he would never be subject to illness, and would always act his best. It never entered into Jefferson's head to doubt the man. He went and had the pills made according to directions. But when he was about to take them the first time, he got very puzzled as to whether the man had said to take two pills twice daily or three pills thrice daily. Again the door opened, and the same eccentric stranger appeared, and said: "I told you to take two pills twice a day."

Ever since . . . Jefferson carried about with him a box of those pills, and invariably took them every time he was about to perform. I do not know what they were composed of.

I give this singular narrative without comment. The reader, of course will have his own opinion regarding it. I should add, however, that I have complete confidence in General Miles' accuracy as a reporter. Nor can I imagine Jefferson taking anyone into his confidence, unless he really believed that the thing happened precisely as related above. It is, however, odd that neither this, nor any other similar psychic experience finds a place in Jefferson's memoirs.

When Jefferson ceased to spend his vacations at Orange Island, he cast about for another place which would serve him as satisfactorily. It was then that he acquired the property at Buzzards' Bay, in Massachusettes. His selection of this retreat was influenced largely by the fact that his crony, Ex-President Cleveland, had already fixed his home at Buzzards' Bay. With advancing years, and the necessity of conserving his waning physical powers, Jefferson reduced the time devoted to professional activities, until at last he spent only twelve weeks on the road during each theatrical season. He eventually refused altogether to appear in what theatrical people know as the "hard season"—that is, from December 15 to March 15. The abbreviations in his routine left the veteran with increasing leisure, and most of this he passed at his beautiful Massachusetts estate. "Crow's Nest" he named it. The property included some one hundred and sixteen acres. In addition to his own spacious residence, Jefferson erected near-by cottages for each of his married children. Thither they came annually with their children, in whose society the aging actor spent some of his happiest hours.

At Buzzard's Bay Jefferson continued to enjoy his favorite diversion of angling. Down to the very end of his life he spent whole days on the water with rod and reel. It was on one of these outings that he contracted the ailment to which he eventually succumbed. He and three friends set out one morning for Big Sandy Pond, a good-sized body of water some distance inland, where the fishing was reported excellent. As day declined, and they were preparing to return home, a heavy mist drifted in from the sea. Wet, cold and greatly fatigued, the little party made its way to "Crow's Nest." Jefferson was left with a severe cold. A physician was summoned. Under his care the old gentleman improved, or seemed to improve, but at his age—he was nearing his seventy-seventh birthday—the shock to his debilitated system was more than he could withstand, and not long afterwards he slipped quietly out of the world which he had done so much to entertain and uplift. He died on April 23, 1905—the anniversary of Shakespeare's death.

It is interesting to note that Jefferson's theatrical history, which, as we have seen, in a very vital sense began in New Orleans came very nearly ending there. He closed the season at the Tulane Theater in 1904 with a two-weeks' engagement, and then, only a week or two later, went to Patterson, New Jersey,

where on May 7 he appeared for the last time before the foot-lights. The visit to New Orleans was a particularly happy one. On the eve of his departure Jefferson said enthusiastically that he had never enjoyed a fortnight so much in the whole course of his life. It was, in a sense, a home-coming. He was especially delighted with the warmth of the reception given him by the public at each of the performances at the theater. The New Orleans Theatrical Mechanics' Association elected him its honorary president, and presented him with a silver loving cup. He came to the city in his private car, but he used it only to sleep in; all the rest of the time he spent either in the theater, or roaming about the streets in the older part of the city, taking his meals in familiar restaurants, and poking around in the curio shops along Royal Street, where the proprietors were acquaintances of long standing and gave him a cordial welcome. In fact, this last visit to the city so long and so affectionately known, had aspects of intimacy which, in the light of what was so soon to occur, invested it with a peculiar personal significance.

Before leaving Jefferson signed a contract to return to the Tulane in 1906. He would gladly have arranged to play there in 1905, but the brevity of his working year made that impossible. He had found that he could not play every year in every city which might wish to see him, and so was compelled to pretermite a visit here and there, in order to meet the demands of his admirers. It was New Orleans' turn to surrender the great actor for the intervening season. Thus it happened that, when Jefferson bade good-bye to the city, he was destined never to see it again. He went away with a heart warmed by the evidences of friendship with which he had been surrounded in New Orleans. And so to Patterson, and to the end.

Let me close this account of a gracious and distinguished man with an anecdote of his early days which Jefferson liked to tell about himself. I quote from General Miles' interesting reminiscences:

It was in Mobile, when Jefferson first played with Forrest, and Jefferson was acting as general utility man in the theater there. The play was "Richard III." In the first part of that play, if you remember, a coffin passes across the stage, and Richard is standing in the way. Jefferson took the part of that particular super who cries in horror to Richard, "Stand back, my lord, and let the coffin pass!"



Joe was so stage-struck at being so near the great Forrest that he was all up in the air. When the cue came, he stepped up to Richard and waved his arm in the air, but no words came. Forrest looked daggers at him. Again he tried it, with no better success, but the third time he managed to gasp out, "Stop that coffin and let the lord appear!"

Forrest made a lunge at him, and muttered under his breath, "Aha, you scoundrel beast!" Only those people in the front row could hear Forrest's words, but they all saw Jefferson's blunder, and if it had not been for Forrest's magnificent acting the audience would have greeted the break with a storm of laughter.

That was probably the only time that Joseph Jefferson made a mistake on the stage.

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*Kendall of the Picayune: Being His Adventures in New Orleans, on the Texan Santa Fé Expedition, in the Mexican War, and in the Colonization of the Texas Frontier.* By Fayette Copeland. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1943. Pp. 351. \$3.00.)

The historical marker in Kendall County, Texas which refers to George Wilkins Kendall, for whom the County was named, as "Poet, Journalist, Author and Farmer; one of the founders of the New Orleans *Picayune*; Member of the Santa Fé Expedition; Most successful sheep raiser in the Southwest" fittingly describes one of the most versatile and colorful figures of his time.

*Kendall of the Picayune* by Fayette Copeland is more than the biography of a man—it is the history of an exciting period in American life when the great Southwest was a disputed area and adventurous men, encouraged by Southern slave expansionists, were willing to undergo the hardships of the wild frontier for cheap land and the prospect of easy fortunes.

The life of George Wilkins Kendall is the story of a courageous Yankee who struck out from his native New England to seek his fortune elsewhere. After learning the printing trade and wandering about the country, he found his way to New Orleans, then the gateway to the Southwest, where with Francis Asbury Lumsden in 1837 he founded the *Picayune*, a four-column, four-page paper, which got its name from the Spanish coin for which it sold, about 6¼ cents, the smallest coin then in wide circulation in New Orleans. The *Picayune* was the first cheap paper in the South and one of the earliest "penny papers" of the country, the first having been established in 1833. Though there were already ten newspapers in existence in New Orleans at the time, the *Picayune* became successful at once and was soon recognized as one of the most influential journals in the South. Much of its success was due to Kendall's versatility and skill as a reporter, as well as to the good management of Lumsden and A. M. Holbrook, who was later brought in as a third partner.

The editors were interested in the fate of Texas, which in 1837 had just gained its independence, and strongly urged annexation. Kendall went to Texas, joined the Santa Fé Expe-

dition, was captured with scores of other members of the Expedition, and marched to Mexico City where he was held prisoner for several months. The accounts of his adventures and hardships appearing in the *Picayune* created widespread interest. Kendall's articles were reprinted by other newspapers throughout the country thus carrying to thousands of readers the stories of Mexican cruelty and duplicity at a time when feeling, particularly in the South, was rising to fever heat against the neighbor to the south.

The knowledge Kendall gained in his experiences with the Mexicans provided a splendid background for his numerous articles on the controversy between the United States and Mexico over Texas; and the *Picayune* soon was regarded, and widely quoted, as an authority on Mexican affairs.

When war broke out with Mexico, Kendall attached himself to General Taylor's army and participated actively in the campaign about Monterrey, and later Mexico City. He thus was the first modern war correspondent writing full reports on the fighting, in which he often participated. While Frank Luther Mott in his history of American journalism suggests that James M. Bradford, editor of the St. Francisville (Louisiana) *Time Piece*, who while fighting with Jackson in the defense of New Orleans wrote letters to his paper describing military operations, was probably the first war correspondent, Kendall was perhaps the first ever to write complete descriptions of day to day combat. His dispatches were sent at considerable expense by specially arranged pony express from Monterrey to New Orleans and later by pony express to Vera Cruz, thence by steamer to New Orleans. So well known was his pony express that it was called "Mr. Kendall's express" and was used regularly despite all hazards. The pony express was relied upon to rush *Picayune* "extras" to the nation, but by 1848 telegraph lines had been extended southward to Petersburg, Virginia, and New York reporters were stationed there to intercept the *Picayune* express and telegraph summaries of the more important stories. Thus, the *Picayune* became the nation's chief source of news from the Mexican front.

After the Mexican War, Kendall went to Paris to rest and to write a history of the War only to find himself in the midst of a Revolution which ended with the abdication of Louis Phil-



ippe and the election of Louis Napoleon as president of the French Republic. Since New Orleans was deeply interested in French affairs, Kendall wrote lengthy articles to the *Picayune*. It was while in Paris that he met and married a young Parisian, taking her later to his ranch near San Antonio.

Kendall earlier had become interested in sheep raising and while in France he purchased a number of fine blooded Spanish Merino rams which he shipped to his Texas ranch. These he crossed with Mexican ewes producing a type with many of the excellent qualities of the Merino, but hardy enough to withstand the Texas winters. Kendall was devoted to ranch life and spent a great deal of his time there developing his herds, but later he was obliged to return to his newspaper.

George Wilkins Kendall was one of the most capable and influential journalists of his time and is deserving of a full-length biography. With the hand of a scholar, Professor Copeland has examined carefully the great mass of primary source material dealing with his subject and in clear and vivid style has woven the details of Kendall's life into a thrilling story of the Southwest. The bibliography is extensive and complete, and the volume is well documented throughout. There is a full index. *Kendall of the Picayune* is a valuable contribution to frontier history and will be found as interesting to the general reader as it is useful to the historian.

The excellence of Copeland's writing has been matched by excellence in bookmaking. The format is well suited to the subject matter, and the volume is singularly free of errors.

MARCUS M. WILKERSON

*Judah P. Benjamin: Confederate Statesman.* By Robert Douthat Meade. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1943. Pp. ix, 432. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.75.)

Amazing is the only word to describe the career of Judah P. Benjamin, one of Louisiana's most famous sons. A Sephardic Jew from the British West Indies, he came to New Orleans as a young man to hang out his law shingle and became one of the greatest lawyers in the nation. Originally poor, he became a rich and progressive sugar planter. He turned his versatile talents to politics and represented Louisiana in the United States Senate

and became a national figure. During the Civil War he was Attorney General, Secretary of War, and Secretary of State in the Cabinet of Jefferson Davis and the right-hand man and trusted confidant of the Confederacy's president. After the collapse of the Confederacy, Benjamin escaped to England and there carved out what is in many respects the most astounding phase of his amazing life. At an age when many men would have felt their active work had been done and in a new country, he resumed the practice of law and became a leader of the British bar. The story of his life is well worth recording. To Louisianians it should prove especially interesting.

Dr. Meade has written a book that undoubtedly will be the definitive life of Benjamin. It is unlikely that any more important Benjamin material will ever come to light to necessitate a revision of the story. The author has put a tremendous amount of research into this book, extending over a period of twelve years. The result is a work of outstanding scholarship.

The reviewer experienced but one feeling of disappointment with this work. While Benjamin's doings are chronicled in minute detail and every aspect of his life is described, the man himself does not quite come alive. This does not indicate, however, that Dr. Meade lacks the ability to breathe life into his subject. The explanation lies in Benjamin's reticence of character. Like Robert E. Lee, Benjamin hid his soul and heart from the picklocks of biographers.

T. HARRY WILLIAMS

*William Preston Johnston: A Transitional Figure of the Confederacy.* By Arthur Marvin Shaw. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. Pp. xv, 299. Illustrations, bibliography, Index. \$3.00.)

Not by any stretch of the imagination could William Preston Johnston be ranked as a figure of dominating importance in the history of his country and times. Yet he deserved a biography. He represents that type of secondary figure whose life and career, when well presented, add to our knowledge and understanding of the main stream of American history. Furthermore, Johnston knew well the great of his day, particularly Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, and Albert Sidney Johnston, his father and in the shadow of whose fame he always lived. Through Johnston we are able to secure new glimpses of these leaders.

The need for a biography of Johnston has been met by the appearance of this book by Professor Shaw of Centenary College. The author presents an adequate account of Johnston's career, tracing his ancestry and early life, his student days at Yale, his attempt to set up as a lawyer in Louisville, the Civil War and Johnston's services as a colonel on President Davis' staff, Johnston's work as a teacher at Washington and Lee University after the war, and his presidency of Louisiana State University and Tulane University. Students of Louisiana history will find the chapters on Johnston's educational activities in this state the most interesting parts of the book. Incidentally, these chapters have more substance and significance than any other part of the volume and give Professor Shaw's work its greatest importance. The description of the beginning years of Tulane is particularly good and is a contribution to the story of education in the New South.

The reviewer offers three criticisms of the biography. The chapter on Johnston's Civil War career is too short, running to about twenty-four pages. It would seem that Johnston's intimate association with Davis might furnish some new information about the inner workings of Confederate politics, particularly about the President's feuds with Generals Joseph E. Johnston and P. G. T. Beauregard. The story of Johnston's problems as a university president would have greater value if accompanied by a more adequate discussion of the handicaps which Southern institutions of higher learning faced in the post-war years and by some comparison of Johnston's work with that of other Southern educators. In the interesting chapter, "Crusader," Johnston appears as an outspoken political liberal, a caustic critic of plutocracy, and a champion of the common man. Indeed, he sounds like a Populist. An analysis of the reasons for his advanced philosophy and its connection with Southern agrarian thought in the 1890's would seem to be in order.

The reviewer is certain that Johnston was an excellent university president. Describing what made a university great, Johnston said: "You may have every external condition of success, endowments, buildings, apparatus, patronage, but if you have a lazy, dull, or incapable faculty, you must fail in great results."

T. HARRY WILLIAMS



*Plantation Life in the Florida Parishes of Louisiana, 1836-1846, as Reflected in the Diary of Bennet H. Barrow.* By Edwin Adams Davis. (Columbia University Studies in the History of American Agriculture, Number 9. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. xiii, 457. \$5.00.)

This volume, which is a revision of a doctoral dissertation in history presented at the Louisiana State University in 1936, is made up of three distinct parts or sections. The Introduction (pp. 3-67) is a general discussion of the location, soil, climate, settlement and development of the Parish of West Feliciana, Louisiana, from its first white occupancy to the 1830's, followed by a somewhat detailed account of rural life, plantation economy and slave management in the parish, with particular emphasis upon the operations and experiences of an individual planter, Bennet H. Barrow, as reflected in his Diary. The Diary of Bennet H. Barrow, 1836-1846, (pp. 71-385) is the heart and core of the volume, giving as it does the daily jottings of this representative planter over a period of a decade. The Appendixes (pp. 389-440) contain such useful sections as the following: "Memoir of the Barrow Family;" "Inventory of the Estate of Bennet H. Barrow;" "Rules of Highland Plantation;" "Bennet H. Barrow Accounts, 1838-1845;" "Table of Cotton Pickings;" "Table of Cotton Sales, 1839-1845;" and "Slaves" on the Barrow estate, including records of "Slave Births, 1835-1846," "Slave Deaths, 1831-1845," and "Misconduct and Punishments of Slaves, 1840-1841." A part of the material contained in the Appendixes has been extracted from the Diary and assembled for convenience, and other sections have been copied from other sources.

The most valuable part of the volume is the Diary. The reader will find in it a day by day account of the labors, diversions, troubles, successes and reverses of a typical ante-bellum cotton planter. The Diary contains not only the record of the diarist's agricultural activities during an important decade in ante-bellum days, but also his intimate thoughts and personal reactions on many subjects. He records his opinions on political and other public questions of the day. He sets down his views on some of the fads and agitations of the period. He reveals his personal likes and dislikes; his estimates of his slaves, his employees, his relatives, his neighbors, casual visitors in his home, his commission merchants, individuals with whom he has all sorts of business relations, local and national politicians, and about

every person who came into his life, are recorded without reservation. His reactions to the weather, the markets, illness and deaths of members of his family, his relatives, his slaves, his neighbors, and even of his dogs and plantation animals, are all recorded; and he gives us a rather adequate account of his financial operations of all sorts, his sporting interests, and the management of his slaves. Many other items of interest to the historian are also briefly touched upon in the Diary. It is an intensely human document, and it reflects the character of the writer in all his moods.

The title of the volume is, in the opinion of this reviewer, broader than the subject. The volume deals with plantation life in but *one* of the *eight* "Florida Parishes" of Louisiana, and the conditions in that one parish were hardly representative of all the "Florida Parishes" a century ago. West Feliciana was probably the most progressive parish of the lot, and its leading families were inclined to be more aristocratic than those in the other parishes of that section of Louisiana. Conditions in West Feliciana a century ago were more nearly like those prevailing in the counties of southwestern Mississippi and in the Natchez district, and are scarcely comparable to those in the other seven Florida Parishes of Louisiana. Communications between West Feliciana and the sections of Mississippi to the north of it were easier than those with other Louisiana parishes to the east; and the prominent families of West Feliciana were related to many of the leading residents of southwestern Mississippi.

The Introduction presents a fairly adequate picture of the West Feliciana region, the general aspects of rural life and plantation economy in the parish as a whole, and the plantation routine, problems and reactions of the individual planter who left behind his valuable Diary for our enlightenment. However, the material in the Introduction does not, in the opinion of this reviewer, exhaust all the possibilities of the Diary. But, in fairness to the author, it may be said that the intention was to emphasize principally the agricultural activities of the diarist in the Introduction, and to deal only briefly with his other activities.

This reviewer has noted several statements in the Introduction which do not appear to square with the entries in the Diary upon which they are based. The statement that Barrow

"began to speculate in sugar futures" (p. 30) seems a little strong when compared with the entry in the Diary, which reads: "Had to Buy 300 Hhe of Sugar at 3 1/2 ct payable 15 November '43 & 1st February 44. to raise money. got advance on it \$7000—more than probable may Loose, had rather run the risk than to be harras'ed to death" (p. 282: March 17, 1843). The Diary entry shows clearly that Barrow bought this sugar as the only means available to him for raising ready cash at that time, and not at all as a speculative venture.

The statement that Barrow "tried wrapping paper around ears of seed corn, in an unsuccessful attempt to facilitate the shelling process" (p. 56), is apparently based upon an entry in the Diary, which reads: "wraped paper around one year corn then shelled it—filled it 4-5th full" (p. 101: October 27, 1837). There is no mention of "seed corn" nor of an attempt to "facilitate the shelling process". This reviewer reads the entry in the Diary as merely an attempt to compare the volume of shelled corn in an ear with the volume of the unshelled ear, and nothing more.

The author states that "Barrow recorded that the cause of the Negro's death was his failure to obey orders to set new posts along the side walls" (p. 44), but the corresponding entry in the Diary reads: "*Blew down* a cotton house Essex was just Finishing covering it it fell and crushed him to Death mashing his brains out. posts were not in the ground deep enough—and only half of the number that were told him to put under it, just yesterday scolding about it" (p. 334: August 3, 1844). How the author derived his interpretation of this passage is beyond the comprehension of this reviewer.

The most amusing divergence from the reading of an entry in the Diary is the statement that "Jack (which this reviewer takes to refer to one of the slaves) once had to wear a sheet topped with red-feathered ear muffs" (p. 50), seemingly based upon the entry: "had the Jack (which this reviewer takes to refer to the plantation Jackass) rigged out this evening with red flannel on his years & a Feather in them & sheet on, 'in the Quarter.' every negro up. Made Alfred and Betsy ride him around the Quarter dismont and take a kiss for quarreling, Jack & Lize Frank & Fanney the same" (p. 202: July 5, 1840). This reviewer can see no logical connection between this entry in the Diary and the author's interpretation of it.



The author states that Barrow "traded his saddle horse 'Chrurkey' to a neighbor for *nearly* [reviewer's Italics] fifty head of cattle" (p. 55), whereas the Diary reads: "Gave my saddle Horse *Chrurkey* for McDermotts stock of cattle *upwards of* [reviewer's Italics] 50 head" (p. 98: September 3, 1837). Needless to say, "nearly" and "upwards of" are not synonyms. Another similar variation from the wording of the Diary is the statement that "He gave Lize and Fanny *a couple* [reviewer's Italics] of switches and 'made them Fight it out.' After one switch was gone, "they seemed quit[e] sick of it" (pp. 49-50), whereas the diary reads: "Lize & Fanny had a fight last night—gave them *three* [reviewer's Italics] oake switches each— & made them Fight it out— they seemed quit sick of it— after one switch was gone" (p. 183: March 6, 1840). Using "a couple" and "three" as though they were synonyms would not be approved by Noah Webster.

While such variations from the text of the Diary do not mar the work as a whole, they may tend to make the reader feel that the author has not devoted to his work that careful attention to details which it deserves. Such errors could easily have been avoided by carefully checking the entries in the Diary against the generalizations made in the Introduction.

The author has attempted to transcribe the Diary exactly as it appears in the original, preserving the spelling, punctuation, capitalization, etc., of the diarist. But this reviewer finds many instances where the punctuation and spacing of the text, as printed, fail to convey the meaning apparently intended by the diarist. It is next to impossible to distinguish the difference between "commas" and "periods" in any century-old manuscript. However, this reviewer feels that the editor of such a document should at least give the writer of the Diary the benefit of the doubt—wherever any doubt exists—and interpret the diarist's punctuation marks in such a way as to bring out the meaning intended.

Several evident errors in transcription of words in the Diary have been noted, of which the following are examples: The use of "laking" rains or "laked" ground (pp. 74, 109, 118, 125, 283, 287, 290), where the diarist evidently wrote "baking" or "baked", as there are several other instances in the Diary where these words are correctly transcribed, particularly when the author

began the word with a capital letter; where the initial letter of the word is a small one, it is almost invariably transcribed as an "l" instead of a "b". "Cappor" (p.83) for "Cappot"; "Emitie" (p. 96) for "Emitic"; "Libertime" (p. 155) for "Libertine"; "purring" (p. 164) for "putting"; "Ruggin" (p. 203) for "Ruffin"; "putting" (p. 211) for "pulling"; "Pauletic" (p. 273) for "Parletic", a phonetic attempt at "paralytic"; all seem to be incorrect desipherments of the diarist's handwriting. And the expression "5 or 8" (p. 195) is so unusual as to arouse a suspicion that it should be "5 or 6". The word "pain" (p. 306: October 21, 1843) should logically read "rain", from the context, although the diarist complained of "pain in my side" on the preceding day. "Granch" (p. 375) should read "Branch". "Petil Gulf" (p. 285 and footnote 90) should read "Petit Gulf". "Greek" (p. 26) should read "Creek", and "leased" (p. 107, footnote 26) should read "leashed".

The most amazing example of misreading the plain meaning of an entry in the Diary is the following: "Received a Letter signed Alexander Brunton *Post marked* [reviewer's Italics] Canada" (p. 231), upon which the editor comments (footnote 75): "as far as it is known Barrow did not send *Post* [reviewer's Italics] the requested sum", which indicates that the first part of "postmarked" was mistaken for the last name of the man.

Such minor slips in transcription and proofreading of such a detailed Diary are exceedingly difficult to eliminate entirely, and the editor must personally perform this tiresome and time-consuming task as a labor of love, if the best results are to be attained. However, the total number of such minor errors is so small in comparison to the number of possibilities for such errors in such a Diary as the one under consideration, that they do not seriously detract from the great value of the work. Perhaps only the very critical reader or reviewer will ever detect these minor errors.

The editor has footnoted the Diary rather sparsely, and the reviewer is of the opinion that many of the footnotes are of very little value to the reader. Many important points in the Diary are passed over without footnotes, whereas other items of lesser importance are footnoted. The Diary contains the names of a great many individuals who should have been identified in footnotes for the benefit of the reader, although it would probably have been

an impossible task to attempt to identify accurately all such names listed in the Diary.

The Glossary (pp. 441-444) is, in the opinion of this reviewer, of little value. Those persons who are sufficiently interested in the subject of Southern plantation economy to read the Diary *in extenso* are already familiar with the terms listed in the Glossary; and those not particularly interested in the subject will not use the Glossary when reading the Diary.

There is an extensive Bibliography of manuscript and printed materials bearing upon the subject under treatment, but many of the entries appear to have little or no bearing upon the materials in the volume. The critical reader is likely to form the impression that the Bibliography is somewhat "padded."

The volume has no index, which, in the opinion of this reviewer, is a serious omission. It is exceedingly discouraging to the reader to pick up a volume of this type and discover that it is without an index. The material contained in the Diary alone is so voluminous and complicated that the omission of an index makes it next to impossible to use the volume as a work of reference. The preparation of an adequate index for a volume of this type is a tedious and time-consuming task, but the readers of the volume would be inclined to bestow praise upon the author and editor if he had performed this labor for their benefit.

Another deficiency in the volume is the omission of a map or plat of any sort. The reader would welcome the addition of a simple map locating West Feliciana Parish in relation to the surrounding regions, showing the position of Highland Plantation in the parish and its relation to other plantations mentioned in the Diary, and locating the towns and villages referred to in the volume. Although a plat of the landholdings of Bennet H. Barrow would probably be difficult to construct after the lapse of a century, its inclusion in the volume would be a great aid to the reader.

In spite of the relatively few minor errors and shortcomings of the volume, it is an extremely valuable contribution to the rapidly accumulating mass of published source materials dealing with the plantation economy and rural life of the ante-bellum South. It is a welcome addition to the literature of Southern History, and every serious student of that subject will wish to



read the volume carefully. Those interested in the history of Louisiana in the ante-bellum period will find in the Diary of Bennet H. Barrow a great deal of valuable material dealing with subjects other than the agricultural operations of the diarist.

WALTER PRICHARD

*The Sword Was Their Passport: A History of American Filibustering in the Mexican Revolution.* By Harris Gaylord Warren. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. Pp. viii, 286. Map, illustration. \$3.00.)

The volume under review is the first serious attempt by a trained historical scholar to write a comprehensive and authentic history of the series of filibustering expeditions launched from United States territory against the Spanish province of Mexico between 1811 and 1821.

Dr. Warren brings to his task the requisite knowledge and understanding of the complicated and confused international situation in Europe which greatly weakened Spain's hold upon her American colonies in the first decade of the nineteenth century, and which rendered Spain powerless to recover her former control over her colonial empire in the New World after the overthrow of Napoleon in 1815. The author is likewise thoroughly familiar with the intricate diplomatic history of the United States from the end of the American Revolution in 1783 to the ratification of the Adams-Onís Treaty in 1821, comprising an almost endless series of controversies with Spain in the Old Southwest. Without this comprehensive knowledge of the European and American backgrounds of his subject it would have been impossible for the author to have set in proper historical perspective the series of filibustering expeditions with which he is particularly concerned.

The filibustering expeditions treated in this volume are in reality a continuation of an earlier series of plots and schemes against Spanish territory hatched upon United States soil following the Louisiana Purchase of 1803. The two most important of these earlier plots—the Burr Conspiracy and the West Florida Revolution of 1810—have previously been adequately treated by competent historians. Dr. Warren has therefore confined his study entirely to those filibustering expeditions connected with

the Mexican Revolution. Beginning with the Gutiérrez-Magee Expedition of 1811, he traces in logical and orderly fashion the various movements as they appear and disappear, down to the failure of the James Long Expedition in 1821.

The task undertaken by the author was a particularly difficult one. The mass of material on the subject is voluminous, and much of it is complicated and confusing. There are plots and counterplots, intrigues of all sorts, at every turn of events. Spanish-American revolutionary leaders, soldiers of fortune, pirates, privateers, smugglers and filibusters continually move across the stage. American statesmen, diplomats, bankers, real estate promoters, lawyers, and adventurers of one sort or another are involved in most of the schemes. French refugees from the reactionary regime following the downfall of Napoleon also appear upon the scene. This multiplicity and variety of actors complicates the plot; and the rather uncertain position of some of our leading statesmen and diplomats of the period serves to lend variety if not clarity to the picture. Moreover, a great deal of romance and mystery has been woven by earlier writers about some of the prominent leaders in the various movements. All this only increased the problems of the author in separating truth from fiction, and in stripping the romance and mystery from the prominent leaders of the filibustering expeditions.

Dr. Warren has succeeded admirably in his task. He has torn the veil of romance and mystery from the subject, and he has reduced to the rank of real historical characters even the Lafitte brothers. The leaders stand revealed in the volume as ordinary flesh and blood characters who were seeking to profit from a complicated situation in international affairs existing at the time of their activities. The elements of strength and weakness of the leaders in the various movements have been revealed, their ambitions and motives have been explained, and the reasons for their successes or failures have been clearly set forth.

This volume is doubtless the definitive work on the subject. The author has diligently explored and utilized all the available manuscript sources as well as the published monographs and articles dealing with various phases of the subject. It is unlikely that sufficient new source material will be unearthed in the future to warrant a re-evaluation of the author's findings. The story moves along in orderly fashion, despite the mass of detail

necessarily brought into the narrative. The author has integrated the various aspects of his subject, and the result is a very interesting and readable volume.

The Bibliography is extensive and complete. The index is quite adequate. The excellent map enables the reader to locate readily all the important places mentioned in the text and to trace the routes of the several expeditions dealt with in the volume. The proofreading seems to have been perfect, as this reviewer has not detected a single typographical error in the work. The format is pleasing, and the publishers have produced an attractive book.

Since most of the filibustering expeditions treated in this work had their origin in Natchez, New Orleans, or Natchitoches, and Louisiana citizens of prominence in that era figure largely in the narrative, students of Louisiana history will wish to read this splendid volume and to add it to their shelf of worthwhile books on the history of their state.

WALTER PRICHARD

*British West Florida, 1763-1783.* By Cecil Johnson. (Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, Number XLII. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1943. Pp. ix, 258. Maps. \$3.00.)

By the terms of the Treaty of Paris which ended the Seven Years' War in 1763, England acquired all the former French possessions east of the Mississippi River—except the Isle of Orleans—and also the former Spanish Florida; and France ceded to Spain Louisiana west of the Mississippi, together with the Isle of Orleans east of that river. Out of this former French and Spanish territory bordering on the Gulf of Mexico, England erected the two new provinces of East and West Florida, each with definite boundaries. West Florida, the only one of the new provinces with which we are concerned here, extended from the Gulf of Mexico on the south to the parallel of the mouth of the Yazoo River on the north, and from the Mississippi River on the west to the Appalachian River on the east. In terms of present-day geography, West Florida comprised the "Florida Parishes" of Louisiana, the panhandle of Florida, and the southern half of Mississippi and Alabama. This new frontier province remained in British possession for only two decades, as it was conquered by Spanish forces in the latter years of the



American Revolutionary War; and both East and West Florida were transferred by England to Spain by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles in 1783.

In the volume under review Professor Johnson of the University of North Carolina has made available the first comprehensive history of the province of West Florida under British domination. The new province was created just at the beginning of a critical period in the history of the British Empire in North America. Its creation was a part of the plan for reorganizing the enlarged British possessions on this continent. Some parts of this reorganization scheme affected adversely the interests of the original thirteen Atlantic seaboard colonies and, after a decade of controversy, culminated in the American Revolution. Although the new frontier province of West Florida took no active part in the revolutionary movement, the disturbed conditions in the Atlantic seaboard colonies affected her development; and toward the end of the conflict she was plundered by American raiders under Captain James Willing on the Mississippi River and later conquered by Spanish forces under Governor Bernardo de Galvez of Louisiana.

When West Florida was created in 1763, Pensacola and Mobile were the chief posts in the province. The former had been the chief post in Spanish Florida, and the latter was the leading French post on the Gulf of Mexico. Pensacola was made the seat of government of the new province. However, the soil along the Gulf coast was not very fertile and before many years had passed the lands along the western edge of the province, bordering the Mississippi River from Bayou Manchac (Iberville River) to the mouth of the Yazoo, were found to be much more desirable for agricultural purposes. Thus the districts of Baton Rouge, Feliciana, and Natchez became the best farming sections of the province before the end of British rule in West Florida. Lands in the province were in the earlier years granted to retired British officers and to settlers arriving from the Atlantic seaboard colonies; and after the outbreak of the American Revolution many persecuted loyalists found new homes in West Florida.

About the time West Florida was organized, the British had erected Fort Bute on the Mississippi at the head of Bayou Manchac (Iberville River) as a defense against possible Spanish attack from New Orleans. The old French Fort Rosalie at

Natchez was also restored and renamed Fort Panmure about the same time. But within a few years both these forts were largely abandoned, leaving the settlers along the banks of the Mississippi without any adequate military protection. The devastation wrought along the Mississippi by the American raiders under Captain Willing in 1778 brought about attempts to afford more adequate protection for the settlements on the western edge of the province. But the British military forces in North America were too much preoccupied elsewhere, and when Galvez led a Spanish expeditionary force up the river in 1779 against Manchac, Baton Rouge, and Natchez, he found the British resistance at these points rather feeble.

Spain felt humiliated by the loss of Florida to England in 1763, and she keenly resented British intrusion in the Gulf of Mexico. Moreover, the French population of Spanish Louisiana were none too loyal to their new masters. While France controlled Louisiana, British traders had carried on a thriving trade with residents of that province. After 1763, with the English entrenched on the Gulf coast and on the lower reaches of the Mississippi, Spanish officials at New Orleans had great difficulty in enforcing their strict commercial regulations. British traders soon established themselves at Manchac, under the shadow of Fort Bute, from which point they smuggled large quantities of merchandise to the French planters on the banks of the Mississippi in Spanish territory. The Spanish officials also found it next to impossible to prevent the illicit trade across Lake Pontchartrain, the northern shore of which was British soil. The British developed a passable waterway from the Gulf to the Mississippi via Lakes Pontchartrain and Maurepas, the Amite River, and Bayou Manchac (Iberville River), thus outwitting the Spaniards who controlled both banks of the Mississippi below the head of Bayou Manchac. The only way in which Spain could break up this illicit British trade originating in West Florida was by seizing that province. Thus she bided her time and awaited the turn of events.

The balance of power in European affairs had been sharply tilted in England's favor as a result of the Seven Years War. Both France and Spain longed for an opportunity to readjust the balance of power in their favor at the expense of England. The outbreak of the American Revolution gave these traditional enemies of Britain the opportunity for which they had been wait-

ing. However, they moved very cautiously at first, giving only secret aid to the revolutionary movements in the British colonies. Finally, in 1778 France made an alliance with the United States, but Spain refused to join such an alliance because of the refusal of the United States to accept the Spanish plan for the final disposition of the territory between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi. In 1779 Spain declared war against England as an ally of France. This was the event which Governor Bernardo de Galvez of Louisiana had long been awaiting. He seized all the British posts in West Florida on the Mississippi in 1779, captured Mobile in 1780, and forced Pensacola to surrender in 1781. In the definitive treaty of peace ending the American Revolution in 1783 the Floridas were transferred to Spain, thus ending the history of West Florida as a British province.

Professor Johnson's volume covers the entire history of British West Florida. The several chapter headings accurately indicate the scope of the work. No phase of the subject is neglected, and the space is well apportioned among the major topics considered. This study is doubtless the definitive work on the subject. It is based upon the original sources found in British and other archival repositories, and the volume evidences a vast amount of painstaking historical research.

The author has done his work well. This reviewer has noted only a few minor slips in proofreading, such as "Charles" as the first name of Clarence Walworth Alvord (pp. 2, 6, 239, 241); "Grimaldo" for "Grimaldi", the Spanish foreign minister (p. 202); "becaused" for "because" (p. 233); and the calling of Fort Panmure at Natchez "French" (p. 212). These minor slips, however, do not detract from the value of the volume. The bibliography is extensive and complete, evidencing the author's familiarity with all the pertinent documentary source materials as well as the authoritative secondary works bearing upon his subject. The index is adequate, and the two maps are very helpful to the reader in locating the important places mentioned in the text and in visualizing West Florida in relation to the surrounding regions. The printers have done their work well and have produced an attractive volume.

This work is a valuable addition to the published literature bearing upon Louisiana history, since the history of West Florida touches that of Louisiana at so many points, from the establish-



ment of the new British province in 1763 down to the time when Spain finally relinquished all claim to "the Floridas" by the terms of the Adams-Onis Treaty of 1819. All serious students of Louisiana history will do well to read this volume, as a sort of side-light; and those who desire to possess the better works dealing with West Florida and its relation to the United States and to Louisiana will give it a place on their shelves beside such other authoritative kindred volumes as the following: James Alton James, *Oliver Pollock: The Life and Times of an Unknown Patriot* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937); John Walton Caghey, *Bernardo de Galvez in Louisiana, 1776-1783* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1934); Arthur Preston Whitaker, *The Spanish-American Frontier, 1783-1795: The Westward Movement and the Spanish Retreat in the Mississippi Valley* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927) and *The Mississippi Question, 1796-1803: A Study in Trade, Politics, and Diplomacy* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1934); Samuel Flagg Bemis, *Pinckney's Treaty: A Study of America's Advantage from Europe's Distress, 1783-1800* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1926); Isaac Joslin Cox, *The West Florida Controversy, 1798-1813* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1918); and Philip Coolidge Brooks, *Diplomacy and the Borderlands: The Adams-Onis Treaty of 1819* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1939).

WALTER PRICHARD

*Flush Production: The Epic of Oil in the Gulf-Southwest.* By Gerald Forbes. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1942. Pp. xi, 253. Map, illustrations. \$2.75.)

This volume gives a brief history of the development of the oil industry in the Gulf-Southwest, comprising the six states of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Arkansas, and Louisiana, from its earliest beginnings to quite recent days. The evolution of the methods employed in locating oil deposits and in recovering the oil is traced in logical order, from the crude and unscientific equipment to the modern scientific and highly technical machinery. The early difficulties encountered in transporting drilling machinery and in providing storage facilities for the crude oil produced are brought out. The development of storage facilities in the oil fields and of pipe lines for transporting the oil to markets or refineries is traced in some detail. The problems

met with in the disposal and utilization of the by-product of natural gas are discussed. And the gradual improvement of the technical processes of refining the crude petroleum into finished products and the development of new uses for the rapidly expanding products of the oil fields are traced in logical sequence.

Several interesting and informative chapters are devoted to such topics as the social and economic effects of the oil industry upon the region, the legal aspects of the industry as changed by new conditions, the various attempts at governmental and other methods of regulating the production of oil and of conserving the natural gas supply, and the tall tales and legends that have grown up about the industry.

The volume is well written. Anyone interested in the history of this great industry in the Gulf-Southwest will find in this work much valuable information. While a relatively small proportion of the text deals specifically with the development of the oil and gas industry in the state of Louisiana, the reader can easily trace in the volume the important stages in the history of the industry in this state.

A helpful glossary of technical terms employed in the oil industry is included at the end of the volume. The extensive bibliography lists the various sources upon which the work is based. The map of the oil regions of the Gulf-Southwest (following p. 75) enables the reader to locate readily any oil field mentioned in the text, and the numerous illustrations add interest and value to the work. The rather detailed index makes it easy to use the volume for reference purposes. The publishers have produced an attractive book.

WALTER PRICHARD

**INDEX TO THE SPANISH JUDICIAL RECORDS OF  
LOUISIANA  
LXXVIII.**

---

**February-March, 1785.**

(Continued from July, 1943, Quarterly)

---

**By LAURA L. PORTEOUS**  
(With Marginal Notes by Walter Prichard)

---

Spanish officials appearing in this installment:

Estaban Miró, Colonel of the Royal Army and Governor General of the Province of Louisiana.

Martin Navarro, Intendant General of the Province of Louisiana.

Juan Ventura Morales, Acting Accountant of the Royal Treasury, ad interim, and Acting Intendant General of the Province of Louisiana, in the absence of Martin Navarro.

Juan Doroteo del Postigo y Balderrama, Assessor General and Auditor of War.

Luis Toutant Beauregard, Regidor Perpetuo-Alcalde Mayor Provincial.

Pascalis de la Barre, Regidor Perpetuo-Alguacil Mayor (Sheriff).

Juan Arnul, Regidor Perpetuo-Receiver of Fines forfeited to the State and for expenditures for Justice.

Nicolas Forstall, Senior Alcalde Ordinario.

René (Renato) Huchet de Kernion, Junior Alcalde Ordinario.

Guido Dufossat, Alcalde Ordinario (1786).

José de Orue, Alcalde Ordinario (1786).

Escribanos (Clerks of Court): Rafael Perdomo; Fernando Rodriguez.

Public Attorneys: Pedro Bertoniére; Antonio Mendez.

Nicolas Fromentin, Deputy Sheriff.

Juan José Duforest, Interpreter for the Court.

Luis Lioteau, Judicial Accountant and Official Taxer of Costs of Court.

Public Appraisers: Joseph Adrian de la Place; Andres Wackernie.

Francisco Sanchez, Warden of the Prison in New Orleans.

Francisco Cruzat, Graduated Lieutenant-Colonel of Grenadiers of the Fixed Regiment of Louisiana, and Lieutenant Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Western Part of Illinois (St. Louis).



February 14, 1785.

**Criminal Proceedings  
Instituted against Jorge  
Rapalie, charged with the  
crime of rebellion in the  
District of Natchez.**

No. 70. 99 pp.

Court of Governor  
Esteban Miro.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Rafael Perdomo.

The proper marginal note for this long  
and complicated case will be supplied  
when the case is indexed in a later  
number of the *Quarterly*. Editor.

Bernardo de Galvez, Viceroy of Mexico, and he, on the advice of his Auditor of War, Felix del Rey, condemns both the Natchez and the New Orleans procedure and decrees that George Rapalie must be exiled from Louisiana. When the latter hears the sentence pronounced against him, he petitions to be given sufficient funds from his property that has been seized to enable him and his family to leave Louisiana. This request is granted and he is given the proceeds from the sale of his slaves.

[Translator's Note:—This very long and important case will be translated in full and printed in a later number of the *Quarterly*.—L.L.P.]

February 15.

**Proceedings brought by  
Antonio Terrazona to be  
granted permission to make  
his domicile in this city.**

No. 66. 8 pp.

Court of Alcalde  
Nicolas Forstall.

This Trial is begun in Natchez where George Rapalie is accused of the crime of having attempted to incite a revolution. Thirteen witnesses give their testimony and are later confronted by the defendant who repudiates some of the evidence brought against him. The records of the case, the accused, and some of the witnesses are sent to New Orleans and Governor Esteban Miro turns the proceedings over to Francisco Bouligny who condemns much that had taken place in Natchez. At George Rapalie's request several of the witnesses are re-examined, and some of the testimony given in Natchez is denied by them. When Francisco Bouligny completes his prosecution, Governor Miro, on Juan del Postigo's advice, sends the entire proceedings to

Antonio Terrason(a), a native of Guarico and now a resident of this city, sets forth that it is convenient to him to prove that he has brought with him, to this city, all the funds he possessed in Guarico, intending to settle in this Port so as to see whether by this means he may increase the small property he has, and in order to be able to do so it will be necessary for him to become a citizen and a merchant here. Therefore he prays the Court to receive the testimony

Assessor, Juan del Postigo. of the witnesses he will present, who must declare, under oath, in accordance with the statement made in this representation.

Escribano, Rafael Perdomo.

This case affords an excellent illustration of the legal procedure by which a new-comer to New Orleans gained the right of citizenship and the privilege of residing and doing business in that city. Five witnesses testify that they know that the petitioner has come to New Orleans to reside permanently, after which the Court declares the applicant a citizen of New Orleans.

He further requests that when this testimony has been received, the depositions will be delivered to him to promote whatever may be convenient to him, as it is justice he prays in due form of law. Alcalde Forstall, on Assessor Postigo's advice, rules: Let the testi-

mony this party offers be received, and done, deliver the depositions to him.

*Testimony of the First Witness.*

In the city of New Orleans, on February 16, 1785, Antonio Terrazona, for the testimony he has offered and that has been ordered received, presents, as a witness, Luis Toutant Beauregard, Regidor Perpetuo and Alcalde Mayor Provincial of this city, to whom the Escribano, in virtue of the commission conferred upon him by the foregoing decree, administered oath, which was taken by God and the Cross, according to law, under charge of which he promised to speak the truth, and when examined on the written petition that begins this proceeding, he said that because of the many years of friendship he has enjoyed with the party presenting him, he knows the latter brought all the funds belonging to him in Guarico, to this city, intending to settle here and to contribute these said funds to the development of the commerce of this city. The witness states that what he has declared is the truth, under his oath, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Luis Toutant Beauregard, before Rafael Perdomo.

*Second Witness.*

Immediately thereafter Antonio Terrazona presented, as a witness, Pedro Miraval, resident of this Port and city, who took oath in the customary way before the Escribano, and when examined upon the tenor of the written petition that begins this suit, he declared that because of business transactions and contracts he has had and made with the party presenting him, over a long period of years, he knows that the latter has brought all the funds he possessed in Guarico, to this city. He came for the purpose of settling here and with the intention to contribute his interests and funds to the development of the commerce of this Port. The witness answered that what he has declared is the truth, under charge of his oath, and that he is 42 years old. He signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Miraval.

*Third Witness.*

Louis Connard, or Cornard, is presented next, and upon taking oath he declared that because of the correspondence he has maintained and does maintain with Antonio de Terrazona, he knows

that the latter has come to this city with the entire fortune he acquired in Garico, with the object of making his domicile in this city and to follow his trade here. The witness answered that what he has stated is the truth, under his oath, that he is 32 years of age, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Louis Connard.

Fourth Witness.

Juan Jacob took the customary oath and testified that because of transactions, contracts and correspondence that he has maintained and does maintain, with the party presenting him, during a long period of years, he knows that the latter has come to this city with all the funds he possessed in Guarico, with the intention of settling in this Port and to contribute his part towards the development of the business of this city. The witness answered that what he has declared is the truth, he is 23 years old, and he signed. (Signed) Jacob.

Fifth Witness.

Antonio Argote is the next to testify, under the customary oath, and he states that all that has been set forth in the aforesaid representation is the truth. This is evident to him because he was present at the time Antonio de Terrazona withdrew from his Company, and that the latter brought the produce to this Port in a frigate belonging to the witness, and that there is not a doubt about this because Mr. Terrazona told him confidentially, that he had, with full deliberation, brought all his property with him to this city, intending to settle here, and that he can answer for him, having seen him engage in several transactions with persons, which proves that he means to establish himself in this city. The witness declares to the truth of his statement, and says he is 35 years of age. (Signed) Antonio Argote.

Antonio de Terrazona petitions to be declared a citizen of New Orleans.

Antonio Terrazona petitions, saying that the records of the case have been delivered to him, together with the testimony taken at his instance, which proves what he has set forth in his foregoing representation, therefore he prays His Honor to declare his request legitimate and valid in all its parts, and to concede him what he has already asked in his abovesaid petition, and also to order a taxation of costs by the Escribano, who must supply him with a certified copy of this entire proceeding, when he will promptly pay all just and due fees. Nicolas Forstall, on Juan del Postigo's advice, accepts this petition and later decrees:

Decree.

In the city of New Orleans, on March 3, 1785, Nicolas Forstall, Alcalde Ordinario of this city and its jurisdiction, having examined the testimony produced for Antonio Terrazona, said he must declare and does declare the aforementioned testimony as sufficient, and in consequence he must declare him a citizen and resident of this city, and so that the abovesaid may have effect,



His Honor interposes and does interpose his authority and judicial decree, ordering a taxation of costs made by Luis Lioteau, and that the petitioner be given a certified copy as he has requested. For this is his decree, thus he has provided, ordered and signed, to which the Escribano attests. Fees 2 pesos. Licenciado Postigo alone signing.

Notification, acceptance and oath.

On the said day, month and year (March 3, 1785), the Escribano notified Luis Lioteau of the part that concerns him in the foregoing decree, and in consequence he said he accepted and did accept the charge to which he has been named, and he swore by God, Our Lord, to proceed with it well and faithfully, according to his legal knowledge and understanding, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Luis Lioteau, before Rafael Perdomo.

[Translator's Note:—The last page of this suit, containing the taxation of costs, has become detached and either mislaid or lost.—L. L. P.]

February 16.

**Guillermo Quais vs. The  
Succession of Francisco  
Duplessi.  
To collect a debt.**

No. 58. 7 pp.

Court of Governor  
Esteban Miro.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Rafael Perdomo.

This suit, brought by a carpenter to collect a small debt due for services rendered to an individual since deceased, contains nothing of any special value or interest, except perhaps the cost of having window glass installed in New Orleans at that time.

plaintiff. Governor Miro, on Assessor Postigo's advice, rules: Let Mathias Alpuente declare whether he knows this debt to be lawful, as Mr. Quays claims.

Mathias Alpuente's declaration.

The Plaintiff presents a bill, which reads:

The Senior Mr. Duplessy (Duplessis) owes Guillermo Quays, Master Carpenter, as follows:

For 5 pairs of window glasses at 5 pesos each, ..... 25 P.  
New Orleans, February 3, 1785.  
(Signed) W. Quays.

Using this bill as a basis for his suit, the plaintiff sets forth that it is evident from the accounting that duly accompanies this request, that Francisco Duplessis, now dead, owes him the sum of 25 pesos. Therefore, so that he may establish his right to take action, he prays the Court to order Mathias Alpuente, Testamentary Executor and Guardian of the Estate left by the Said Duplessis, to declare, under oath, whether he knows this debt to be lawful, and done, deliver his deposition to the

In the city of New Orleans, on February 17, 1785, the Escribano, in compliance with the foregoing decree, went to Mathias Alpuente's dwelling house to receive the declaration he has been

ordered to make, and upon arriving there he accepted his oath taken by God and the Cross, according to law, under charge of which he promised to speak the truth, and when the bill, presented on page 1, was placed on manifest, he said it is correct and just, and he knows this to be true because he was present when the debt was contracted. He answered that what he has declared is the truth, under his oath, he is 25 years of age and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Mathias Alpuente.

Guillermo Quays petitions for payment of his bill.

The plaintiff states that in the Executory Proceeding he has brought against the late Francisco Duplessis' estate, the records of the case have been delivered to him, together with Mathias Alpuente's declaration, made at his instance, and considering that his demand has been proven to be just, may it please the Court to order the Testamentary Executor to pay this bill within two days, with a warning that if he does not do so, His Lordship will have to impose a penalty upon him. Governor Miro, on Assessor Postigo's advice, receives this petition and later decrees:

Decree.

Whereas: Let the Testamentary Executor, Mathias Alpuente, Guardian of the late Francisco Duplessis' estate, pay Guillermo Quays the sum of 25 pesos, which are due him. Fees 2 pesos. (Signed) Estevan Miro; Licenciado Postigo.

The Plaintiff prays for a taxation of the costs of the case.

Guillermo Quays petition, saying the Court has ordered his bill of 25 pesos paid, which has been proven due, without having made any provision for the taxation of costs, or by whom these must be paid, therefore he prays Governor Miro to declare to this effect and order a taxation of same, by the Public Taxer. Esteban Miro, on Juan del Postigo's advice, decrees: Let the costs of the case be paid by the succession. Petition granted for the remainder of the request made by this party in his principal representation.

Taxation of Costs.

23, 1785.

Costs are taxed by Luis Lioteau at 9 pesos 2½ reales, on December

February 16.

**Criminal Proceedings.**  
**Guillermo Parbaus vs. Juan Espinosa, For robbery.**

No. 87. 15 pp.

The case opens with a certified copy of a Notarial Act, executed before Rafael Perdomo, dated February 18, 1785, by which Guillermo Parbaus appoints Antonio Mendez, Procurador Publico del Numero, to act as his attorney for the prosecution of a criminal suit

Court of Alcalde  
Nicolas Forstall.

No Assessor.

Escribano, Rafael Perdomo.

This suit, brought against a Spaniard for robbery with which he was charged by a slave, illustrates the difficulty of getting at the truth of such accusations made by slaves to hide their own criminal acts. After examination of witnesses, the Court is convinced that the slave is the real culprit; and said slave was sentenced to receive fifty lashes in the Public Square and to be kept in shackles for two months in his master's house. However, the Spaniard who was accused by the slave of the robbery, appears to have borne a bad reputation in the community; and, although he was acquitted of the robbery charge, he was fined ten pesos, to be applied to the public works of New Orleans, for having given or sold brandy to Negroes several times, and was given a stern warning against such offenses in future. Costs of the suit were levied against the plaintiff, since he had not proven his charges against the accused Spaniard.

he has brought against Juan Espinosa, for robbery.

Guillermo Parbaus presents the foregoing power of attorney and sets forth that he makes a civil and criminal complaint against Juan Espinosa, who through a lack of the fear of God and respect for Royal Justice, at 8 o'clock in the morning of the day before, has entered the plaintiff's cabaret, during his absence and while his slave, Miguel, was left in charge, and taking advantage of this opportunity, he made the Negro drunk, so as to have more freedom to carry out his evil intentions and to commit robbery. For this purpose he broke open the door of the bedroom, which was done by forcing the padlock, and having entered, he examined what was there, then went back to his own house, that is near by, but before going

he arranged with Miguel to carry some rolls of tobacco, amounting to 18 bales, besides several pounds of indigo, weighing about 3 pounds in all. Therefore, in order to ascertain the truth and to punish Espinosa and any other accomplices that may have taken part in this affair, may it please the Court to receive the testimony of the witnesses he will present, who, under oath, in due form of law, subject to its penalties and without delay, will declare according to the contents of this representation and anything else that may have come under their notice upon the particulars of this case.

He further prays that when the witnesses he presents have given their testimony, if the result conforms to what he has stated, the Court will order the confession of the accused taken.

In a second minor petition, the plaintiff asks that it may please His Honor to order the Escribano, accompanied by the Deputy Sheriff, to seize all property belonging to Mr. Espinosa, immediately, and to place same in charge of the General Receiver, and to notify him to this effect.

In a third minor petition, Mr. Parbaus states that, considering the defendant has been placed in the Public Prison on a verbal order of this Court, it may please His Honor to request the warden of the said Prison to make a formal arrest and not to permit the prisoner to treat or communicate with anyone. Nicholas Forstall rules: To the principal petition, let the testimony the plaintiff



offers be received; entrust the taking of it to the Escribano, and done, bring the depositions to the Court. To the minor requests, as it is prayed.

*Seizure of the prisoner's property.*

On the said day, month and year (February 18, 1785), the Escribano, accompanied by the Deputy Sheriff, went to make the seizure, as ordered, but they did not find any property to seize, in testimony whereof they set this down as a matter of record, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Perdomo.

*Declaration of the First Witness.*

In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year, the Escribano, in virtue of the commission conferred upon him to take the testimony Guillermo Parbaus offered to give and that has been ordered received, presented as his first witness, Bartolome Antonio, a resident of this city, to whom oath was administered by the said Escribano, which was made by God and the Cross, according to law, under charge of which he promised to speak the truth, and when examined upon the principal part of the written petition that begins this proceeding, he said he did not see Espanosa enter the house, nor was he there when Parbaus found the door broken open. All he knows is what he heard Mr. Parbaus' Negro tell his master, after the slave's pockets were examined and found to be full of indigo. Miguel was punished to make him confess where he was taking it, and he then told his owner that he had taken the indigo to deliver it to Espinosa, who had entered the cabaret and forced the padlock of the door, and while doing so the intruder left him as a sentinel to warn him of his master's return. In the interval, according to the declaration of the Negro, the defendant removed 4 pounds, but the witness was not present when he did so, nor is he positive of the charges brought against the accused. The only thing he saw was half a bottle of wine that was found in the Negro's trunk, which the said Espinosa had given him, and a receipt signed by Juan Ventura Morales for the rental of a house, as money. He answered that what he has declared is the truth, under charge of his oath, he is 41 years of age, and he did not sign because he does not know how to write, to which the Escribano attests.

*Declaration of the Second Witness.*

Guillermo Parbaus presents Bartolome Guiens, as a witness, who, under oath administered as above, declared that he does not know all that is contained in the representation, but having bought 47½ pounds of indigo from Parbaus, 20½ from the Maltise, and 6 from a person whose name he does not know, he put it all in a sack and left it in the plaintiff's house, in his keeping, until he could find a barrel for storing it. As it happened, today at half-past six or seven o'clock this morning, while standing on the levee, the said Espinosa came up to the witness to arrange with him for the sale of 15 or 16 pounds of indigo. He asked about its quality and was told it was middling, and that later he could

go to his house to see it, where they could come to an agreement in case it pleased him; then Espinosa and the witness separated, and a little while after he met Parbaus who asked him whether he knew that he had been robbed the night before; he answered no, but because the said Parbaus was keeping the indigo, already mentioned, in his house, he went there and found the sack containing it had been opened and he noticed some of it was missing. He suggested that he go with him to weigh it, which they did, while he was selling some salt meat, and they found it lacked 16½ pounds. Then the plaintiff punished Miguel to make him confess who was the thief, and he said it was the man from the other door who entered the house the day before, by breaking the padlock with a hammer, and that 4 pounds of indigo had been taken, according to the declaration made by the Negro to his master. The witness answered that what he has stated is the truth, under charge of his oath, and that he is 27 years of age. He did not sign because he does not know how to write.

*Miguel's Declaration.*

In the city of New Orleans, on the nineteenth of February of the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty-five, Guillermo Parbaus, for the testimony he has offered and that was ordered received, presented, as a witness, his Negro slave, Miguel, from whom the Escribano, in virtue of the commission conferred upon him, by means of Juan Jose Duforest, Public Interpreter, exacted oath which was made by God and the Cross, according to law, under charge of which he promised to speak the truth, and being examined upon the tenor of the foregoing written petition, by the Interpreter, he said that day before yesterday, at eight o'clock in the morning, one named Espinosa entered his master's house, while he was custodian, and asked whether he could sell him a little indigo, and he answered he did not have the keys; although he did have them, he would not sell to him because if he did his master would punish him immediately. Then the said Espinosa told him he could very well sell it to him and that his master would not notice that some was missing, but he answered he did not have the keys, and at that Espinosa turned and said he had a hammer to open the door, to which the witness answered he could do what he felt like. Then Espinosa broke the padlock on the door with the hammer, and the witness found himself in the street, half drunk, because he had taken two glasses of wine in which a measure of one-half brandy was served to knock him out. During this interval Espinosa left with a handkerchief full of indigo, and, judging from its bulk, he thinks it must have been 4 pounds. He did not take away anything else, not even the tobacco, as stated in the representation that has been read to him by the Interpreter. The day following, he went to ask Espinosa for the money for the indigo, and the latter gave him a folded note for 2 reales and another that did not contain any money. He answered that what he has declared is the truth,



under charge of his oath, and that he is from 18 to 20 years old, and he did not sign because he does not know how to write; the aforesaid Interpreters signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Juan Josef Duforest, before Rafael Perdoma, Clerk of the Court.

The Fourth Witness testifies.

Immediately after, Guillermo Parbaus presented Pedro Mayron, as a witness, who declared, under oath, that he does not know all that is contained in the representation; the only thing he does know, because he has seen it, is that before the robbery which Mr. Parbaus says was committed against him, his Negro was standing talking at the witness' house, when the latter saw that Miguel's pockets were stuffed full, for which reason he went to examine him and, having done so, found a portion of indigo. He accused the slave of being a great thief and asked him where he was going with the indigo he had stolen from his master. He answered he was going to take it to Espanosa, who lived beside him, but as he did not know to whom he referred, he did not investigate. The only thing he did do was to call a carpenter and another, a person whose name he does not know, so that he would have witnesses to the Negro's robbery. Then his master came, and when he had informed him of what had taken place, he punished his slave to make him confess where he was taking the indigo, and the Negro stated it was for the Spaniard, living beside him, who had asked for it. He went immediately to the said Spaniard's home to ascertain the truth, but found the latter had gone to the house where the Negro was tied up, and that Miguel told Espinosa that he, Espinosa, was guilty of the crime for which his master was punishing him and that he could well pay the money for the indigo and the tobacco. Then Espinosa told Miguel that he was a rogue and a thief and that he himself was incapable of committing such a base act. Matters remained in this condition without Mr. Parbaus making other inquiries for ascertaining the truth of what has already been stated. All that he has set forth took place more than a month ago. The witness answered that what he has declared is the truth, under charge of his oath, he is 37 years of age, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Pierre Mayron, before Rafael Perdomo.

Decree.

Whereas: From the summary testimony Guillermo Parbaus has supplied, he does not seem to have proven the crime of robbery he imputes to Juan Espinosa, considering that none of the deponents testify that they saw him break the padlock of the door, as stated, nor did they find the indigo and tobacco in his house, as has been attributed to him, nor did he remove these commodities, as charged; but on the contrary Mr. Parbaus's slave was the one who was found with his pockets full of indigo, as the aforesaid witnesses have affirmed. Therefore the Court is clearly convinced that the said Negro is the real thief, and that to save



himself from having to suffer the punishment his master has given him to make him confess the truth, he was cunning enough to charge the said Espinosa with the crime. His Honor said that, attentive to these reasons set forth, together with everything else that has been worthy of consideration, he must condemn and does condemn Miguel to 50 strokes of the lash, which will be given to him in the Public Square of this city; after all formalities have been complied with and the punishment having been given, the Negro will be returned to his master, who is charged to keep him in shackles, in his house, for the space of two months, so that by this means an exemplary punishment may be inflicted and public vengeance satisfied. And for what concerns a slight resumption of guilt, against Espinosa, resulting from the summary investigation, charging him with having given, or sold, brandy to the Negroes several times, contrary to Superior Orders that have been repeatedly issued against drinking, by the Government, to check the fatal consequences due to drink, for this insubordination he condemns him to pay a fine of 10 pesos to be applied to the public works of the city, with a warning that if in the future he should commit the same offense, he will be punished with all the rigors of the law. Therefore, since the crime of robbery the plaintiff has imputed to him, is undeserved, this judgment leaves him with his good name, credit and reputation unimpaired, so that it must not be held against him, as an affront, at any future time. Let Mr. Espinosa be set at liberty and the costs of the case taxed, which must be paid by Mr. Parbaus, since he has not proven his charge. For thus His Honor has decreed, ordered and signed. (Signed) Nicolas Forstall.

Note.

In compliance with a verbal order of the Judge of this cause, a copy of this sentence was drawn up and given to Pascalis de la Barre, Regidor Alguacil Mayor (Sheriff), dated as above, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Perdomo.

Second Note.

Dated this day, the Escribano went to the Office of the Principal Accountant, for Judgments, for a certification of the foregoing sentence for the exaction of the fines which Juan Espinosa was condemned to pay and another like copy for Juan Arnul, who is Regidor Receiver of fines forfeited to the State and for expenditures for Justice, for the same reason. New Orleans, April 6, 1785, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Perdomo.

February 24.

**Maria Theresa, a free mulatress, petitions for the freedom of her mother, Francisca, a Negress.**

Maria Theresa, a free mulatress, petitions to say that it is her wish to remove her mother, a Negress, aged about 50 years, belonging to Mrs. Garic, from the state of slavery, therefore she prays it may please the Court to

No. 3087. 7 pp.

Court of Governor  
Esteban Miro.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Fernando  
Rodriguez.

order her appraised, and the aforementioned lady to grant her an act of emancipation, in conformity to law. For this purpose she names, as her appraiser, Andres Wackerny. She further prays His Lordship to approve this appointment, and that the said Wackerny be notified for his acceptance and oath. Governor Miro orders this petition sent to Mrs. Garic.

This case illustrates the procedure in purchasing the freedom of a slave. A free mulattress, daughter of said slave, petitions the Governor for the privilege of purchasing the freedom of her mother, and naming an appraiser to assist in placing a valuation upon the slave. The owner of the slave makes no objection to the procedure, and names another appraiser on her part. The two appraisers agree upon the value of the slave. But the case is incomplete as it stands, as the final disposition of the case is not given.

Mrs. Garic offers no objections to this emancipation.

Estefania de Guyon, widow of Juan Bautista Garic, resident of this city, in due form of law, presents herself before His Lordship to answer the proceedings brought against her by the free mulattress, Maria Theresa, to obtain the freedom of her mother, Francisca, the defendant's slave, at the price of her appraisement, etc. This request has been delivered to her, in consideration of which she says she offers no objections to granting the Negress her freedom, at the price that may be fixed by appraisers, and to this end she appoints Josef Adriano de la Place as hers, and prays His Lordship to confirm her nominee and to notify him for his acceptance and oath. Governor Miro accepts this petition, and later decrees:

Decree.

Let the experts be named that this party (and the plaintiff) mention; they must accept and take oath in due and proper form, and done, let them appear in his Court Room the following day. (Signed) Miro.

Acceptation and oath of Adriano de la Place.

On the said day, month and year (March 9, 1785), the Escribano personally notified Adriano de la Place of the foregoing decree, and he said he accepted and did accept, and he swore by God, Our Lord, and the Cross, to proceed well and faithfully with the duty assigned to him, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Adriano de la Place, before Fernando Rodriguez.

Andres Wackernie accepts.

On the said day, month and year, the Escribano personally notified Andres Wackernie of the foregoing decree, and he said he accepted and did accept and swore by God, Our Lord, and the Cross, to proceed well and faithfully (with the appraisement), and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Wackernie, before Fernando Rodriguez.

The Appraisers make an estimate.

In the city of New Orleans, on March 10, 1785, Esteban Miro, Colonel of the Fixed Regiment of Infantry of this Place and Governor, ad interim, of this Province, being in his Court Room, where there were present, before His Lordship and the Escribano, Adriano de la Place and Andres Wackernie, summoned to make an estimate of a Negress belonging to the Juan Bautista Garic Succession. These experts unanimously agreed and said that they appraised her at 300 pesos, and they declared that this estimate had been made well and faithfully, and they signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Wackernie; Adriano de la Place.

February 28.

**Criminal Prosecution of Mrs. Pertuit's slave, Cupidon, and his accomplices, for robbery.**

No. 3007. 27 pp.

Court of Alcalde  
René Huchet de Kernion.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Fernando  
Rodriguez.

This suit, brought against a Negro slave and his accomplices, for robbery, illustrates the difficulty of arriving at the truth when all the witnesses are either Negro slaves or free Negroes. However, after examining all the witnesses, the Court decided that the slave was the real culprit, and he was sentenced to receive two hundred lashes at the hands of the public executioner; and the free Negro baker, his accomplice, was sentenced to imprisonment for three months in the Public Prison, with rations and without wages, and to pay the entire costs of the proceedings.

In the city of New Orleans, on February 28, 1785, Renato Huchet de Kernion, Junior Alcalde of this city and its jurisdiction for His Majesty, said that he has just been notified that on the day before, the 27th current, at about 7 o'clock at night, a robbery was committed at Widow Pertuit's house, and for the production of evidence of the crime, His Honor ordered this act drawn up which begins the process, and that by its tenor all persons must be examined, who may have any knowledge of what has happened. For thus His Honor has decreed, so he has ordered and signed. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion, before Fernando Rodriguez.



*Mrs. Pertuit's declaration.*

In the city of New Orleans, on March 1, 1785, Alcalde Renato de Kernion caused Mariana Durriocher (Durocher), widow of Nicolas Pertuit, to appear, from whom His Honor, before the Escribano, exacted oath, which she took by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, under charge of which she promised to speak the truth, and when examined upon the tenor of the act that begins these proceedings, she declared that on the night of the 27th, at about half-past seven, she heard screams in the courtyard of her house, and having gone to the rescue she knew it was a little girl, her daughter, who had called. The child told her they had been robbed, and in fact she found a sack full of flour, about a half-barrel, in the courtyard, and in accordance with all indications, she thinks the thief is her Negro slave, Cupidon. This is the truth, under charge of her oath, she is 40 years of age, and she did not sign because she does not know how to write. His honor signed, with the Escribano. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion, before Fernando Rodriguez.

*Decree.*

In the city of New Orleans, on March 1, 1785, Alcalde de Kernion said that in virtue of Mrs. Pertuit's declaration, her slave, the Negro, Cupidon, must be charged with the theft, therefore he orders and does order a writ of imprisonment issued against this Negro, and let it be made evident by certification of the Warden of the Prison that he holds him in his keeping, then proceed to take his declaration. For this is His Honor's decision, thus he has ordered, decreed and signed. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion.

*Order for the Arrest.*

Let any Minister of Justice apprehend the Negro, Cupidon, Mrs. Pertuit's slave, and place him in the public prison, as by decree rendered. New Orleans, March 1, 1785. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion, before Fernando Rodriguez, Clerk of the Court.

*The Arrest.*

In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year, before the Escribano, appeared Nicolas Fromentin, Deputy Sheriff, and he said that in virtue of the Writ on the reverse side of this sheet of paper, he placed Widow Pertuit's Negro, Cupidon, in the public prison of this city, which he sets down as a matter of record, and he signed. This entry is unsigned.

*Notification and certification*

On the said day, the Escribano personally notified Francisco Sanchez, Warden of the Prison, (of the foregoing decree) and he said that he had Widow Pertuit's Negro slave, Cupidon, in his charge, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. The above is unsigned by Sanchez, attested to by Fernando Rodriguez.

*Cupidon's Declaration.*

In the city of New Orleans, on March 2, 1785, Renato Huchet de Kernion, Junior Alcalde of this city and its jurisdiction for His Majesty, went to the Royal Prison where he caused a prisoner

to appear before him, to whom oath was administered before the Escribano, which was taken by God, Our Lord, and a Cross, according to law, under charge of which he promised to speak the truth, whereupon the following questions were put to him:

Asked his name, age, state and what occupation or trade he followed? He answered his name is Cupidon, he is aged 46 years, a slave of Widow Pertuit, a bachelor and a baker.

Questioned as to where he was on Sunday, the 27th of the current month? He said he went for a walk in this city and at about 7 o'clock at night he returned to his house.

With whom did he communicate and hold conversation on that said day? He answered, with the free Negro, Chaco (Jacques).

At what hour did he speak and upon what subject? They talked with each other at about 4 or 5 o'clock, and they conversed about various matters that he does not remember.

At what hour did he separate from the Negro and where? They separated at the corner by his owner, Mrs. Pertuit's house, at about half-past seven at night.

Does he know anything about the theft of flour that was stolen from his mistress, on that said night and at the same hour he said he separated from the Negro, also a baker by trade? He said he knows the incident to be true because he agreed with the Negro, Chaque, to steal the portion of flour that was found in the courtyard and that the said Negro was hidden behind a pigpen, in the coutryard, waiting for the witness to deliver the stolen flour to him, but on hearing the screams of his owner's daughter, who yelled robbers, the witness fled, leaving the sack in the said courtyard which he had stolen to turn over to Chaque, so that he could buy some striped linen trousers for himself. He does not now know Chaco's whereabouts.

Questioned whether he had intimate intercourse with Chaque and his wife? He answered he had never been acquainted with him, nor did he know where his dwelling house was located; he had only known him by sight when he met him in the street. He then stated that what he has declared is the truth, under charge of the oath he has taken. He did not sign because he does not know how. His Honor signed, together with the Escribano who attests to the foregoing declaration.

*Jacques' Declaration.*

In the city of New Orleans, on March 3, 1785, Renato Huchet de Kernion, Alcalde Ordinario of this city, went to the Royal Prison where he caused Jacques, a free Negro, to appear before him, from whom, His Honor, before the Escribano, exacted oath, which was taken by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, under

charge of which he promised to speak the truth, whereupon the following questions were put to him:

Does he know Cupidon, Mrs. Pertuit's slave? Yes, considering he has worked at his house, on some Sundays, helping his wife, Julia, to knead.

Where was he Sunday, the 27th of February? He was in his house; later he left it to go for a walk on the levee, some time after midday and that afternoon he spent walking on the levee.

At what hour did he go back to his house? At about half-past seven at night of the same day.

Did he talk to Cupidon that night? Yes, he walked past Mrs. Pertuit's gate where he saw Cupidon standing at the said gate of the courtyard; he told the witness to wait there as he had something to tell him, and for this reason he waited for a little while, but seeing that Cupidon delayed, he went to his own house.

Did he tell him why he should wait? No. And that this is the truth, under charge of his oath. He is 46 years old, and he did not sign because he does not know how. His Honor signed, to which the Escribano attests.

*Decree.*

In the city of New Orleans, on March 3, 1785, Alcalde Renato Huchet de Kernion, having examined the declaration of Mrs. Pertuit's slave, Cupidon, and of Santiago (Jacques), the free Negro, said that he must order and did order, a writ of imprisonment and seizure of property against the latter and his wife, Julia, the said property to remain in the keeping of a trustworthy neighbor, to avoid costs. And all done, let the Warden of the Prison make it evident, by certification, that he holds them in his keeping, then proceed to receive from them a confession and a declaration, respectively. For thus His Honor has decreed, ordered and signed, to which the Escribano attests.

*Writ of Arrest.*

Let any Minister of Justice apprehend the free Negroes, Jacques and Julia, his wife, seize their property and place them, as prisoners, in the public prison, as by decree rendered this day, concerning this matter. Thus His Honor has ordered. New Orleans, March 3, 1785. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion.

*Arrest of Jacques.*

In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year (March 3, 1785), before the Escribano, appeared Nicolas Fromentin, Deputy Sheriff, and he said that in virtue of the Writ on the reverse side of this sheet of paper, he apprehended the Negro, Jacques, and placed him in the Public Prison. The Deputy Sheriff signed, to which the Escribano attests. Unsigned by Fromentin.



**Arrest of Julia.**

On the said day, before the Escribano, appeared Nicolas Fromentin, Deputy Sheriff, and he said that in virtue of the foregoing Writ, he placed the free Negress, Julia, wife of the free Negro, Jacques, a prisoner in the Public Prison of this city. The Deputy Sheriff asked the Escribano to set this down as a matter of record, which he signed. Unsigned by Fromentin.

**Certification of the Warden of the Prison.**

In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year, the Escribano personally notified Francisco Sanchez of the part of the decree, dated this day, that concerns him, and he said that he holds the Negroes, Chacques and Julia, man and wife, as prisoners, in his charge, and he sets this down as a matter of record, to which the Escribano attests.

**Seizure.**

In the city of New Orleans, on March 4, 1785, Nicolas Fromentin, Deputy Sheriff, accompanied by the Escribano, in virtue of the Writ that was ordered issued in the foregoing decree, went to the residence of Jacques and Julia, to seize their property, which was done before the Escribano, in the following manner: firstly, 4 figured napkins, 7 vests, of different colors, 2 waistcoats, 4 trimmed shirts, 1 other shirt, 5 petticoats, 16 handkerchiefs, 9 pairs of trousers, long and short, 4 more shirts for men and women, 1 more handkerchief, 3 petticoats, 1 shawl, 3 waists, 4 pairs of stockings, good and bad, 1 bundle of linen cloth, in bad condition, 2½ rolls of tobacco, 3 dishes, 1 trunk, that has been unlocked, another small trunk, 1 bed with 2 feather mattresses and 1 straw one and 1 mosquito bar, 1½ barrels of flour, 1 large earthen jar, besides 53 pesos in paper money, and not finding anymore property to seize, in this said house, the proceedings were suspended, to be continued when convenient. The Deputy Sheriff signed, to which the Escribano attests. Fromentin does not sign.

**Declaration of Julia, the free Negress.**

In the city of New Orleans, on March 5, 1785, Alcalde Renato Huchet de Kernion went to the Public Prison, where he caused to appear before him, a Negress, imprisoned there in this cause, from whom, before the Escribano, oath was received, which she took by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, in conformity to law, under charge of which she promised to speak the truth, whereupon the following questions were put to her:

What is her name, age, state and occupation? She answered she is called Julia, she is married to the free Negro, Jacques, she is 50 years old and a baker by trade.

Who apprehended her, on whose orders and for what cause? The Deputy Sheriff apprehended her and made her a prisoner, on His Honor's order, but she does not know for what cause.

Does she know Cupidon, Mrs. Pertuit's slave? Yes, he has gone to her house twice and has helped her put bread in the oven.

Where was her husband on Sunday, the 27th of February? Until midday he was in her company; he went out before dinner and returned at about 8 o'clock at night of the same day.

On this same day, the 27th, did Mrs. Pertuit's slave, Cupidon, go to her house, or did she see him talking to her husband? He was not at her house on that day, nor did she see him talking to her husband.

Did she hold conversation with Cupidon at any other time? About two months before, Cupidon was at her house, and told her that Fanson (Fanchon), a free Negress, was willing to sell him a note for 250 pesos due her by the witness, and considering that Fanson would sell at a loss of 50 pesos, she said to him that he must do what seemed best to him, but that she could not give or pay him the said sum unless he gave her sufficient time, and also that Fanson had told her that she wished to sell her note for cash to a person with whom she was treating for it.

Does she know who unlocked her trunk after she was made a prisoner? She does not know. She gave the key to Marion Boré to deliver to the mulatto, Pedro, the witness' son. She sent word by the same person to tell him to take 125 pesos which she had in this trunk and with it to pay 74 pesos to Esteban, the baker, and with the remainder to pay other debts.

Has her son paid them as she directed him to do? She does not know, and she states that what she has declared is the truth, under charge of her oath, and that she is the age she has already testified. She did not sign because she does not know how to write.

*Declaration of Pedro, the free mulatto.* In the city of New Orleans, on March 6, 1785, Alcalde Renato de Kernion went to the Royal Prison where he caused to appear, Pedro, the free mulatto, who took oath before the Escribano, by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, to speak the truth, and when examined upon the tenor of what his mother, Julia, has just declared, he answered that he did not know anything of the matter contained in her deposition. He did not take the keys, as stated, and he said that this is the truth, under charge of his oath. He is 30 years of age, and he did not sign because he does not know how to write.

*Declaration of Marion Boré.* In the city of New Orleans, on March 8, 1785, Alcalde de Kernion went to the Royal Prison, where he caused Marion Boré, a free Negress, to appear, and oath was administered to her, before the Escribano, which she took by God, Our Lord, and a Cross, according to law, under charge of which she promised to speak the truth, and when examined upon Julia's statement, she said

it is true that Julia delivered a key to her to give to her son, Pedro, a free mulatto, and to tell him to take the money out of the chest to pay her debts, but it so happened that she could not deliver the key, nor talk to the mulatto. This is the truth, under charge of her oath, she is 45 years old, and she did not sign.

Decree.

In the city of New Orleans, on March 8, 1785, Alcalde de Kernion said that he again recommends the imprisonment of the Negroes, Cupidon, Mrs. Pertuit's slave, Santiago, a free man, and his wife, Julia. Let this said imprisonment be made evident by certification of the Warden of the Prison, then proceed to receive their confessions, and make the charges and accusations against them, in accordance with the testimony received in the summary investigation.

Confession of Jacques.

In the city of New Orleans, on March 9, 1785, Alcalde Renato de Kernion went to the Royal Prison, where he caused to appear before him, the free Negro, Santiago (Jacques), and after oath was administered, the following questions were put to him:

Does he remember having made a declaration in these proceedings, and does he wish to have it read to him and made a part of his confession? He said yes, and having read to him what is set down on page (space left for the number of the page), the witness stated that he affirmed and ratified what he declared in it and has nothing to take from or add to his deposition, and that he will make the same declaration over again, whenever it may be convenient for him to do so.

Does he remember having denied being in Mrs. Pertuit's courtyard at 8 o'clock at night on Sunday, the 27th of February, by agreement with the Negro, Cupidon, to wait while the latter stole the flour? It is not true that he went into the courtyard, nor did he have an agreement with the said Negro to commit robbery.

Reminded that he must speak the truth? He answered that what he has declared is the truth, under charge of his oath, and that he is the age he has already stated. He did not sign because he does not know how to write.

Confession of Julia.

In the city of New Orleans, on March 10, 1785, Alcalde de Kernion went to the Public Prison where he caused Julia to appear before him and after oath was administered to her by the Escribano, the following questions were put to her:

Does she remember having made a declaration in these proceedings, and does she wish to have it read to her and made a part of her confession? She answered yes, and having read to her what appears on page (space left for the number of the page), she said it is as she had deposed and that she will make the same statement over again, whenever requested to do so.



What reason had she for denying the truth by saying that Cupidon had not helped her to knead bread, when it is evident from her husband's declaration that he did? She said it is affirmed in the said declaration because it is the truth.

Does she not know that it is a crime to conceal robberies, or to continue to help those who steal? She answered she knows this, but she was not an accomplice in anything she has been questioned upon, and although other and different questions and cross questions were put to her concerning the case, she said the same thing, which she declared is the truth, under charge of her oath, and that she is the age she has already stated. Julia did not sign because she cannot write.

Decree.

New Orleans, March 14, 1785.

Considering the Negro, Chaque's denial, let him be confronted with the Negro, Cupidon.

In the city of New Orleans, on March 14, 1785, Alcalde Renato

Huchet de Kernion went to the Royal Prison, where he caused to appear before him, Mrs. Pertuit's Negro slave, Cupidon, and Chaque, a free man, for the purpose of confronting them with each other, and His Honor having received their oath, which were administered to them by the Escribano, which they took by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, according to law, whereby they promised to speak the truth, and upon reading to them their declarations and confessions recorded in these proceedings, they said: firstly, Cupidon declared that what he has deposed is the truth; then Jacques, the free Negro, said that Sunday, February 27th, was an unfortunate day for him. His Honor reminded him to speak the truth openly and to answer the charge Cupidon had made against him that both had agreed to steal the flour. He made the same answer, namely: that it was an unfortunate day for him, and that he had nothing more to say. And notwithstanding that His Honor questioned him on the particulars of several accusations, to all he gave the same answer, that this is the truth under charge of his oath. They both declared they are the ages they have already stated, and they did not sign because they do not know how to write.

Fanchon's Declaration.

In the city of New Orleans, on

March 16, 1785, Alcalde de Kernion went to the Royal Prison where he caused Fanchon, a free Negress, to appear before him, and under her oath, administered by the Escribano, she was examined on the tenor of Julia's statement concerning what Cupidon had told her, namely, that he was willing to buy her obligation (note) for 200 pesos from the witness. She answered this is not true, she never had treated with Cupidon to sell Julia's obligation of 250 pesos for 200 pesos, but it is true that he did tell her, Fanchon, that he could not wait any longer for his money. This is the truth, under the oath she has taken, and she is 50 years of age.

Julia petitions to be released from prison. A marginal note specifies that this petition is presented by a person who does not know how to write. (Signed) Rodriguez, Clerk of the Court.

Julia, a free Negress, in the criminal proceedings prosecuted against her husband, Chaco, at Mrs. Pertuit's request, for suspected robbery, sets forth that nothing has been proven against her from her declaration, therefore she prays His Honor to order her released from prison and to deliver her property to her, that was seized, which she obligates herself to place at the disposition of the Court. Alcalde de Kernion receives this petition, and on March 21, 1785, decrees:

Decree. Considering this party's representation, with the condition to be at the disposition of this Court, let Julia be released from prison and let her property, that was seized, be returned to her.

Pedro petitions to be released from prison. Pedro, a free mulatto, a prisoner in the Royal Prison, through circumstantial evidence, because of a robbery that is said to have been committed by Cupidon, Mrs. Pertuit's slave, in accordance with an agreement made with the Negro, Chaco, his stepfather, petitions, saying that neither from his declaration, nor from the testimony of the witnesses, in the summary investigation, has any criminality been proven against him. Therefore he prays to be released from prison where he is now held. Alcalde de Kernion receives this petition and on March 30, 1785, decrees:

Decree. Whereas: Release from prison the mulatto, Pedro, who is held at the disposition of this Court, on orders previously issued.

Second Decree. Send these proceedings to the Auditor, so that the Alcalde may consult him for the sentence that must be rendered.

Auditor Postigo's Advice. I have examined the proceedings that have been sent to my office, for consultation, against the Negro, Cupidon, belonging to Mrs., the Widow Pertuit. From the testimony no guilt has been proven against Jacques, the free Negro, except the accusation brought against him by the principal culprit; this, in law, is not enough to make him an accomplice in the crime with which he has been charged by one who is a slave, and because there is nothing more than his declaration, I am of the opinion that the Negro, Jacques, should be set at liberty, and that Cupidon should be punished with the penalty that the Judge may hold suitable. (Signed) Licenciado Postigo.

Sentence. In the city of New Orleans, on the twelfth of April of the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty-five, Renato Huchet de Kernion, Alcalde Ordinario of this city and its jurisdiction for

His Majesty, having examined these records, said that because Mrs. Pertuit's slave, the Negro, Cupidon, has been proven guilty of having stolen flour to deliver to the free Negro, Santiago, His Honor must condemn and does condemn the said Cupidon to 200 strokes of the lash, in the customary way, and the said Santiago to three months in the prison of this place, with rations and without wages, and to pay the costs of this process, which will be taxed by Luis Lioteau, who must first accept and take oath. For so His Honor has decreed, thus he has ordered and signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion.

*Certification of the Sentence.*

The foregoing sentence was given and pronounced by Renato Huchet de Kernion, Alcalde Ordinario of this city for His Majesty, holding Public Audience in the city of New Orleans, on the twelfth of April of the year one thousand seven hundred and eighty-five, and he signed, before the witnesses Josef Beca(t), Adriano de la Place and Francisco Lioto (Lioteau), residents of this city, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Fernando Rodriguez, Clerk of the Court.

*The Warden of the Prison is notified.*

Fernando Rodriguez certifies and attests that, in fulfillment of the foregoing decree, he went to the Royal Prison of this city, and having notified the Warden of the Prison of the part of the contents of the foregoing decree that concerns him, he immediately notified the Negro, Cupidon, Mrs. Pertuit's slave, and Santiago, the free Negro, each one personally, to which the Escribano attests.

*Cupidon is lashed.*

Fernando Rodriguez certifies and attests that on this day, Cupidon, Mrs. Pertuit's slave, was taken out of the Royal Prison and was tied to a cart where he was given 200 strokes of the lash by the executioner, in the customary places. The Deputy Sheriff was present at this act, which is attested to by the Escribano. New Orleans, April 15, 1785. (Signed) Rodriguez.

*Notification.*

Fernando Rodriguez states that he drew up a copy of the foregoing sentence and delivered it to the Office of the Secretary of the Government for the assignment of rations that it calls for, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Rodriguez.

*Luis Lioteau is notified.*

In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year (April 15, 1785), the Escribano personally notified Luis Lioteau, Taxer, of the foregoing decree.

[Translator's Note:—There is no record to show that Luis Lioteau accepted and took oath to tax the costs of the case, but it is to be supposed that he did and that the Clerk of the Court failed to write it down.—L. L. P.]



Taxation of Costs.

March 1.

**Santiago Le Duc vs. Bacilio Ximenes, Testamentary Executor of the Succession of Luisa Carmuche. To collect a debt.**

No. 51. 7 pp.

Court of Alcalde  
Nicholas Forstall.

No Assessor.

Escribano, Rafael Perdomo.

This suit, brought by an eminent New Orleans physician to collect from a succession a bill for professional services rendered to the deceased over a period of some two and one-half years, contains no features of particular interest. The testamentary executor of the succession acknowledges the validity of the bill and offers no objections to its size. The Court orders the bill, with costs of suit, paid from the funds of the succession.

mand, as to what he may know about the matter. The Court rules: The bill having been presented, let the Testamentary Executor and Guardian of the estate, swear and declare, as petitioned; entrust the taking of his testimony (to the Escribano), and done, deliver the deposition to the plaintiff.

Declaration.

In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year (March 1, 1785), the Escribano, in compliance with the foregoing decree, went to the house of Bacilio Ximenes, Testamentary Executor and Guardian of Luisa Caramuche's estate, where he received the oath taken by God and the Cross, according to law, under charge of which he promised to speak the truth, and when examined upon the tenor of the foregoing petition and the bill presented on page 1, he said that it is true in all its contents, that he has full knowledge of the matter and that at the death of Doña Maria Luisa, his mother-in-law, the amount stipulated in the bill still remained due. He answered that what he has declared is the truth, under charge of his oath, he is 45 years of age, and he signed. (Signed) Basilio Ximenes.

On April 19, 1785, Luis Lioteau taxes costs at 77 pesos  $\frac{1}{2}$  real.

This suit opens with Dr. Le Duc's bill, reading: The Succession of Mr. Du Bord owes the sum of 23 pesos 4 reales, according to the account already rendered to Bazile (Ximenes), Executor of the said succession, for treatment of illnesses, medicines, visits and trips to the plantation, made and furnished to the said house, from June 21, 1775, to December 9, 1777. Dated New Orleans, February 1, 1785. (Signed) Le Duc.

With this exhibit as a basis for his claim, Santiago Le Duc, Surgeon, appears at Court and in a petition, sets forth: That, as may be proven from his bill, duly presented, the succession of Luisa Caramuche owes him 23 pesos, and although he has instituted several proceedings to collect, he has not been able to obtain his money. Therefore he prays Alcalde Forstall to order Bacilio Ximenes, Testamentary Executor and Guardian of the estate, to declare to the tenor of this written de-

The Plaintiff petitions for payment of his debt.

Dr. Le Duc stated that the records of the case have been delivered to him, together with the declaration given at his instance, from which it may be proven that his demand is just. Therefore he prays the Court to order the Testamentary Executor to pay his debt. Alcalde Forstall orders this petition sent to the Curator of the minors.

The Curator answers.

Pedro Bertonière, Public Attorney and Curator to the minor children of Luisa Caramuche, Widow Dubord, in answer to the suit brought by Dr. Santiago Le Duc, avers that as it appears from Basilio Ximenes' declaration, the amount claimed is legitimate, therefore he offers no objections to the payment of this debt from the funds of the Caramuche estate and prays the Court to decide in accordance with justice. Alcalde Forstall receives this petition and later decrees:

Decree.

Whereas: Since the Testamentary Executor acknowledges that this sum is owed to Dr. Le Duc by the late Luisa Caramuche, let it be paid from the funds of her succession by Basilio Ximenes, upon the signing of a corresponding receipt by the plaintiff, which will prove for all times that the debt has been paid.

The record ends here.

March 2.

**Francisco Monplaisir,**  
a free mulatto, vs.  
**Carlos Lacoste, to cause**  
**him to return a Negro**  
**belonging to the plaintiff.**

No. 3070. 6 pp.

Court of Governor  
Esteban Miro.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Fernando  
Rodriguez.

This suit, brought by a free Negro to recover possession of a slave owned by him, who has been hired to make a voyage on a ship to St. Louis, is of interest for the light the proceedings throw upon the difficulties of commerce on the Mississippi River in those days, and the case with which a slave might escape.

The first entry is a certified copy of a Notarial Act of Sale, dated January 28, 1785, executed before Fernando Rodriguez, which reads, in part: That Santiago Fontenet, resident of the Post of Chapula (Tchoupitoulas?), of this Province, sells to Francisco Monplaisir, a free quadroon, a Negro slave, named Gregorio, aged about 26 years, the said slave was sold to him on September 23, 1783, by a simple piece of paper, to serve in the interval until the execution of these presents. It was stated at the time of the sale that the Negro suffered from an incurable sore on his left foot, free of all liens and mortgages, as the present Escribano certifies, as annotator of same. This slave was bought at public auction, at the German Coast, before the Commander there. He is now sold for 200 pesos cash, which the vendor has received, and because the Notary was not present at the delivery,

he renounces the exception of non numerata pecunia and authorizes a formal receipt, by means of which full and entire possession of the Negro is given to the vendee, who in turn may dispose of him as his own property. The purchaser, here present, accepts the sale in the presence of the following witnesses: Santiago Le Duc, Carlos Grifon and Santiago Lemort (Lemothe).

The Plaintiff states his claim.

Francisco Monplaisir, through his attorney, Pedro Bertonière, presents the above exhibit and alleges that as this instrument shows, he owns a slave, Gregorio, aged about 26, whom he has hired to one named Chaser to make a trip to Natchez, with the condition that as soon as they arrived there, he would be returned to the petitioner in this Capital City; but in the interval a boat belonging to Carlos Leconte reached Natchez, that went on up to Illinois. It has come to his notice that the said Leconte asked his slave to go with him, which he consented to do, and actually did make the voyage. And whereas the said Leconte should not have engaged his slave without informing the plaintiff, and at least obtained his permission, and because of what he has done, grave prejudices have followed the delay in returning the Negro to this Port and for these reasons the responsibility lies with the defendant, therefore he prays the Court to order a despatch issued in due form and sent to Francisco Cruzat, Governor of the said Post, enclosing this petition and the ruling to same, so that upon seeing them he may institute the proceedings necessary for making the investigation, and if the testimony received conforms to what he has set forth, arrest his slave and seize all the property that he may have and remit them to this Court, at the cost and risk of the one who is liable according to law. He further prays to have Mr. Leconte notified that either for himself, or by some one empowered to act for him, he must appear in this Tribunal to take cognizance and to defend him in these proceedings.

Decree.

Let the Commander of the Post of Saint Louis, Illinois, secure the person of the Negro, named Gregorio, belonging to Francisco Monplaisir, who was taken up there in Carlos Leconte's boat. Seize the said slave and all the property belonging to him found in his possession and remit them to this Capital on the first occasion, at the said Leconte's expense, who must also pay for the full time the slave has been in his service, and that he may retain him until he will be returned to this city. New Orleans, March 2, 1785. Fees 1 peso. (Signed) Estevan Miro, on the advice of Licenciado Postigo, also signing.

Receipt.

Twenty reales have been paid in my Office. New Orleans, March 8, 1785. (Signed) Rodriguez.



Commander Cruzat's statement.

I, Francisco Cruzat, Commander and Lieutenant Governor of the western part of Illinois; in default of an Escribano, notified Guillermo Lecomte of the foregoing decree, speaking to him in person, and in testimony whereof I have signed in Saint Louis, Illinois, July 25, 1785. (Signed) Francisco Cruzat.

Guillaume Hebert Le Compte makes a declaration to Commander Francisco Cruzat.

The defendant addresses a petition to Don Francisco Cruzat, Graduated Lieutenant Colonel, Captain of Grenadiers, Fixed Regiment of Louisiana, and Commander-in-Chief of the West Part of Illinois:

Sir: Guillaume Le Compte, citizen of this Port, in answer to the suit brought by the free mulatto, Francisco Monplaisir, sets forth that he owns a boat in partnership with Mr. Troquira, to make trips to the Capital, and that when coming up the river to his destination, he stopped at Natchez to unload cargo where a Negro, named Gregoire, was presented to the petitioner, who questioned him. The said Negro declared that he was free, and in consequence, since no difficulty existed, he engaged him as free, and at the same time he took the testimony from one named Etienne, who assured him that Gregoire had been employed by him and not by Mr. Chauery, at that time. If the petitioner had known that he was a slave, he would not have hired him, as such an act is contrary to law. Etienne told the defendant that he had engaged the Negro at Pointe Coupée, so for that reason he could hire him. There was a shipwreck, en route, and the two owners and the crew landed at the Post of Kas Kas Kais, after having saved a very small part of the cargo, and they settled all their obligations, including the Negro mentioned above, under the title of a free man.

The petitioner, on legal notice from the plaintiff and by virtue of the order of Mr. (Cruzat), went to look for the Negro, having heard that he was living in Kas Kas Kais, in the eastern part of this county. Arriving at the said place, he made the arrest, with orders from the Commander, and has brought him here and placed him under Mr. Cruzat's authority, for which he expects to be idemnified. Saint Louis, Illinois, July 29, 1785. (Signed) Guillaume Hebert Le Comt.

Francisco Cruzat's decree.

Let the present petition be remitted, together with the rest of the proceedings and the Negro, named Gregorio, belonging to Francisco Monplaisir, to the Court of the Governor General of this Province, so that he may determine as the law requires. Given in Saint Louis, Illinois, July 30, 1785. (Signed) Francisco Cruzat.

[Translator's Note:—The record ends here and is probably resumed at some future date, in New Orleans, before Governor Miro, or may be dropped by the plaintiff when he recovers his property.—L. L. P.]

March 10.

**Proceedings brought by Enrique Desprez against Juan Bautista De Gruis, for Breach of Contract, through delay in delivering wood to the plaintiff's mill.**

No. 69. 5 pp.

Court of Governor  
Esteban Miro.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Rafael Perdomo.

This suit, brought to collect damages for breach of contract, presents no features of particular interest. As the record stands here, the proceedings are incomplete.

the said damages, prejudices and losses may be held to the account and risk of the defendant. In testimony whereof he executes this instrument of protest and signs with the witnesses, here present, who are Francisco Carcasses and Manuel Monrroy. (Signed) Enrique Desprez, before Rafael Perdomo.

Enrique Desprez petitions, averring that, as may be proven from the attached certified copy, Juan Bautista De Gruis entered into a contract with him to supply his mill with 1200 feet of lumber, but owing to a delay in delivery, which should have been made promptly, so as to take advantage of high water, has caused damages and losses to him. Therefore, in order to give greater credit to what he has already stated, he prays the Court to summon the witnesses he will name, who under oath will testify to the tenor of what he has just set forth. Governor Miro, on Juan del Postigo's advice, rules: The Protest having been presented, let the evidence this party offers be received, and done, deliver the depositions of his said witnesses to him.

The record ends here.

This suit begins with a certified copy of a Notarial Act of Protest, which reads, in part: In the city of New Orleans, on March 7, 1785, before the undersigned Notary and witnesses, appeared Enrique Desprez, Captain of the Urban Militia and resident of this city, who declared that Juan Bautista De Gruis obligated himself to supply the Plaintiff's mill with 1200 feet of lumber, at once, so that when the river rose, it could be sawed into 12 and 14 feet lengths, for the sum of 600 pesos, as set forth in greater detail in the contract drawn up on May 29, 1784. However, because of a delay in delivering the wood, for reasons already stated, namely: During the time of high water, the petitioner has suffered damages, prejudices and losses, therefore he protests for the first, second, third time, and as often as the law requires, so that in virtue of same,

March 10.

**Succession of  
Catalina Chenal,  
Widow Languetau.  
Inventory and appraise-  
ment of her estate.**

No. 3009. 90 pp.

Courts of Alcaldes  
Huchet de Kernion  
and Guido Dufossat.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Fernando  
Rodriguez.

These proceedings for the settlement of a succession follow the usual legal procedure in such cases. There is the collection of the keys, the search for a will, the appointment by the Court of a Curator to the minor heirs and an attorney to represent the interests of the absent heirs of age, the authorization of the inventory of the property of the succession, appointment of the appraisers, inventory of the real and personal effects left by the deceased, sale of said property at public auction, appointment of a guardian of the funds of the estate, and partition of the proceeds among the legal heirs, all as per orders of the Court. The items listed in the inventory, and the prices at which they were appraised and sold, are of interest to the student of the social and economic history of Spanish colonial Louisiana.

Collection of the Keys.

Immediately after, the Escribano went to Widow Lintau's dwelling house to ask for the keys left by the deceased, and the one to her armoire was delivered to him by her daughter, Widow Jacquelin, upon which he placed the seals, according to custom, and he sets this down as a matter of record. (Signed) Fernando Rodriguez.

Order to search for the Will.

On March 10, 1785, Alcalde de Kernion decrees: Let the Escribanos del Numero certify whether Widow Lentau executed a will, or any disposition, before them, and done, return the records to the Court.

Certifications of the Escribanos.

In compliance with the foregoing decree, Notary Public Rafael Perdomo was notified, in person, who said, in the best form of law that he can and must, he certifies that neither before him,

The first entry is the official announcement of the death, reading: In the city of New Orleans, on March 10, 1785, Reynato (René) Huchet de Kernion, Alcalde Ordinario of this city and its jurisdiction for His Majesty, said that he had just been informed of the death of Catalina Chenal, Widow Lentau (Languetau), who left minor and heirs of age, and for the security of her estate, His Honor orders this act drawn up by which he commissions the present Escribano to collect the keys, and done, bring them to the Court so that all further necessary decrees may be rendered. For thus His Honor provides, orders and signs. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion.



nor in the Archives in his charge, has a will, or any other disposition been executed for Widow Lentau, to which he attests and signs. New Orleans, March 10, 1785. Perdomo fails to sign.

Supposedly Fernando Rodriguez certifies. In the city of New Orleans, on the said day month and year, in fulfillment of the foregoing decree, I certify and attest that neither before me, nor in the Archives in my charge, has a will, or any other disposition been executed for Widow Lentau. Unsigned.

Decree to appoint a Curator and an attorney for the heirs. New Orleans, March 11, 1785. Considering that Widow Lentau has died intestate, leaving minor and heirs of age, therefore, so that there may be some one to represent them, His Honor said that he must name and does name as Curator to the minor heirs, Pedro Bertonièr (e), Procurador del Numero, who must accept, take oath and give bond, in due form of law, and for the defense of the absent heirs of age, Antonio Mendez, Procurador del Numero, who must accept and take oath, and done, return the records to the Court so that he may appoint the Curator and defender to their respective charges.

Notification, acceptance, oath and bond. In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year, (March 11, 1785), the Escribano personally notified Pedro Bertonièr, Public Attorney, of his appointment to the Curatorship *ad lites*, by the foregoing decree, and he said that he accepted and did accept, and he swore by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, according to law, to proceed well and faithfully with the defense of the minors, in case of necessity taking counsel of learned, conscientious persons who can and must give it to him, and Josef Beca (Becat), here present, at the execution of this written instrument, said that he constituted himself bondsman for Pedro Bertonièr and obligated himself to see that the latter fulfills the duties of his charge, and failing to do so, as his bondsman, he will pay for all damages and prejudices caused by faulty defense. Thus he agrees and sign. The witnesses, here present, are Francisco Lioteau, Adrian de la Place and Santiago Lemaire. This entry is unsigned.

Notification, acceptance and oath. On the said day, month and year, the Escribano notified Antonio Mendez, in person, and he said that he accepted and did accept, and he swore by God and the Cross to proceed well and faithfully with the duties of his charge, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Antonio Mendez, before Fernando Rodriguez.

The Court confirms the above appointments. In the city of New Orleans, on March 12, 1785, Renato Huchet de Kernion, Alcalde Ordinario of this city for His Majesty, having seen the acceptance, oath and bond, given by Pedro Bertonièr, Procurador del Numero, as Curator

ad lites for the minor heirs of Widow Lentau, His Honor said he must appoint and does appoint him to the charge, and as such he gives and does give the power for what will be necessary in law to enable him to represent the rights of the said minors, and in case of necessity he must ask the counsel of learned, conscientious persons who can and must give it to him. For so His Honor provides, thus he decrees and signs, to which the Escribano attests, and that he has delivered the records of the proceedings to the Curator so that he may promote whatever may be suitable. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion.

The Curator petitions to make an inventory.

Pedro Bertonière, Curator ad lites to the minor heirs of Widow Lentau, petitions, saying that the records of the case have been delivered to him to represent the rights of his clients, therefore he prays the Court to order an inventory taken of the estate left by her. The Court rules to send this petition to the defender of the absent heirs.

Antonio Mendes answers, saying he offers no objections.

Antonio Mendez, Attorney named to defend the absent heirs of widow Lentau, in the proceedings to settle her intestate succession, answering the petition made by the Curator to the minors, asking to have an inventory taken of her estate, avers that, as this request is just and in conformity to law, he offers no objections to it. The Alcalde receives this petition and later decrees.

Decree.

Whereas: Proceed with the making of the inventory and appraisal of the estate left by Catalina Chenal, Widow Lentau. Let the parties be notified so that they may place it on manifest at once.

Pedro Bertonière asks to name Adrian de la Place his appraiser.

Pedro Bertonière petitions, stating that an inventory and appraisal has been ordered made of Widow Lintau's property, therefore, so that the abovesaid may be carried into effect, he names Adrian de la Place, Public Expert, as his appraiser, and he prays the Court to decree that the other parties must name theirs. Alcalde Kernion rules: Let the appraiser that this party mentions be appointed; he must take oath and declare in due form of law. Notify the other party to name his, with a warning to proceed with the one appointed.

Notification, acceptation and oath.

On the said day, the Escribano notified Adrian de la Place, in person, who said that he accepted and did accept and swore by God, Our Lord, and a Cross, according to law, etc., and he signed, to which the Escribano attests.

Antonio Mendes appoints Andres Guacarny (Wackernie) as his appraiser.

Antonio Mendez, as Attorney named to defend the absent heirs of Catalina Chenal, Widow Lentau, namely: Santiago, Felicite, Catalina, Angelica, Francisca, Nanon,

and Antonio Lepino, children of Mrs. Lentau's first marriage to Santiago Lepino, sets forth that he has been ordered to name an appraiser to put a just price on the estate left by the deceased, and in compliance with the said decree, he names Andres Guacarny (Wackernie) to act for his clients. Alcade de Kernion rules: Let the appraiser that this party selects be appointed; he must be notified for his acceptance and oath.

Notification, acceptance and oath

On the said day, the Escribano personally notified Andres Guacarny of his appointment, who said that he accepted and did accept, and he swore by God, Our Lord, and the Cross, according to law, etc., and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. (Unsigned.)

The Curator petitions to have a day assigned for the taking of the inventory.

Pedro Bertoniére, in a petition, avers that an inventory and estimation of the Lintot (Languetau) estate has been ordered made, therefore he prays the Court to assign a day for this purpose. The Court rules: Let the 5th of next April be assigned as the day for the taking of the inventory. Notify the interested parties to this effect.

Inventory.

In the city of New Orleans, on April 5, 1785, Renato Huchet de Kernion, went to the dwelling house of Catalina Chenal, Widow Lentau, to begin the proceedings for the making of an inventory and appraisement of her estate, in the presence of Pedro Bertoniére, Curator to Antonio and Estevan Lepine; and Antonio Mendez, representing Santiago, Felicite, Catalina, Angelica, Francisca, Nanon, and Antonio (?) Lepine, absent heirs of age, children by Widow Lentau's first husband, Santiago Lepine; and also Adrian de la Place and Andres Guacarny, Public Appraisers. The following estimate was made of the estate.

9 printed calico petticoats, half worn, estimated at	35	Pesos
2 white petticoats valued at	3	"
8 short jackets, half worn, of different kinds of calico	10	"
14 new chemises, valued at	20	"
18 coarse table napkins, half worn, valued at	3	"
5 sheets at	20	"
1 black cambric cape	6	"
16 handkerchiefs, good and bad	8	"
1 fine, soft undervest at	4	"
7 small tablecloths	6	"
8 pairs of cotton thread stockings	3	"
1 walnut armoire at	45	"
1 small cypress table at	2	"
6 straw chairs, half used, and one with arms at	4	"
2 woollen and 1 feather mattress, one in good condition with a feather pillow, and 1 calico drapery (bed curtain), valued at	40	"



1 muslin mosquito bar valued at.....	8	"
1 woollen and 1 feather mattress, 1 mosquito bar, much used .....	29	"
2 old bedspreads valued at.....	12	"
1 small mirror with a gold frame.....	5	"
4 silver covered dishes valued at.....	20	"
2 copper candlesticks.....	2	"
1 pair of chimney irons, shovel and tongs.....	6	"
1 small cypress cupboard.....	3	"
1 small earthen jar.....	6	"
1 small armoire.....	3	"
10 dishes, 5 pitchers, 1 soup tureen, 1 salad bowl, 4 cups, and 1 jug.....	7	"
1 frying pan, gridiron, 5 pots, 1 skimmer, 1 pair of chimney irons, and 1 axe.....	7	"
30 bottles and 1 demijohn.....	6	"
1 large and 1 small tubs.....	5	"
Total.....	324	"

At this stage, because there were no other movables to inventory, except the slaves, they began with them in the following manner:

Firstly, a mulattress named Margarita, aged 27 years, pregnant, valued at..... 1000 pesos

A negress, named Teresa, aged 55 years, estimated at ..... 400 "

Because there were no other movables to inventory, His Honor suspended this proceeding, which he signed, with the parties and appraisers, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion; Luis Lambert; Pedro Bertonière; Fame Toutcheque; Antonio Mendez; before Fernando Rodriguez, Notary Public and Clerk of the Court.

Inventory continued.

In the city of New Orleans, on April 6, 1785, Alcalde Renato Huchet de Kernion went to the late Catalina Chenal's dwelling house to make an estimate of her estate, in the presence of Pedro Bertonière, Curator to the minors, Antonio Mendez, representing the absent heirs, and Adrian de la Place and Andres Guacarny, Public Appraisers.

[Note:—Andres Guacarny does not sign the inventories, apparently not present, although he had been appointed by the Court at Antonio Mendez' request, without opposition from Bertonière.—L. L. P.]

The estimate is made in the following manner:

Firstly, a lot of ground measuring 60 feet front by 120 deep, situated on Bienville Street, adjoined on one side by Widow Lione's real property and on the other by Mrs. Dubornois' place, upon which a house has been constructed, 42 feet front by different depths, built of brick between wood, roofed with shingles, and a brick chimney, in good condition, with kitchen made of stakes in the ground, also having a brick chimney, valued at..... 2400 pesos

This proceeding is now concluded, because there is no other real property to inventory. It is signed, as above.

Inventory of the notes and papers.

On April 6, 1785, an inventory of the papers is taken in the presence of the same officials and interested parties, and reads:

Firstly, Leonardo Mazange's note for 900 pesos, in favor of the deceased, dated November 1, 1784, paraphed and labeled..... No. 1.

A note signed by Antonio Lepine for 50 pesos, dated July 2, 1784, also paraphed and labeled..... No. 2.

Note signed by Pedro Tardela for 8 pesos, dated August 22, 1758..... No. 3.

Another note signed by Luis Lambert for 660 pesos in favor of the abovesaid, dated April 6, 1784..... No. 4.

Note signed by Mrs. Pertuit for 10 pesos, dated October 6, 1781..... No. 5.

Note signed by Mariana Bergeron, widow of Guillermo Bienvenu, for 1328 pesos 2 reales, dated October 20, 1784..... No. 6.

Another signed by Francisco Pertuit for 290 pesos, dated January 3, 1781..... No. 7.

Because there were no other papers to inventory, His Honor ordered this proceeding closed. It was signed by Alcalde Huchet de Kernion, Antonio Mendez and Pedro Bertonière, before Fernando Rodriguez, Clerk of the Court. The appraisers did not sign; since the papers were notes, each one stipulating its own value, they did not require a further estimation.

Pedro Bertonière petitions to have the Court approve the Inventory and Appraisalment.

The Curator sets forth that the inventory and estimation of Widow Lentau's estate has been finished, and having examined it carefully,

he has found it to be just and drawn up according to law, therefore he prays the Court to approve same and to condemn the other parties to abide by it. The Alcalde orders this petition sent to the defender of the absent heirs.

Antonio Mendez offers no objections to the above request.

Antonio Mendez, representing the heirs of age, answers, saying that he has been given a petition asking the approval of the inventory and appraisement of the Lentau estate, and as he finds that it conforms to law and has been properly drawn up, he prays the Court to order the interested parties to abide by it. Alcalde de Kernion receives this request and later decrees:

Decree.

Whereas: With the consent of the parties, he approves the inventory and appraisement of the estate left by Catalina Chenal, Widow Lento, and in consequence His Honor said that he must condemn and does condemn the parties to abide by it.

The Curator asks for the sale of the estate.

Pedro Bertoni re states that as the inventory and appraisement have been approved, he therefore prays the Court to order the sale of the movables for cash, and the slaves and house on time to be paid for within one year. Ren  Huchet de Kernion orders this request sent to Antonio Mendez.

The Defender of the absent heirs answers.

Antonio Mendez answers, stating that he has been given the petition presented by the Curator of the minors, requesting the sale of the Lentau estate, the movables for cash, and the slaves and house on time, and considering that this demand is just, he prays the Court to decree: As it is prayed. Alcalde de Kernion receives the above and on April 12, 1785, decrees:

Decree.

Whereas: With the consent of the parties, proceed with the sale, as requested.

Pedro Bertoni re asks for the Public Calls for the sale.

The Curator avers that the estate has been ordered sold, therefore he prays the Court to decree that the Public Calls be made as the law requires. Alcalde de Kernion rules: As it is prayed.

The three Public Calls.

The first call is given in these words: On April 13th, 1785, I, the Escribano, standing at the doors of the Public Office in my charge, gave the first Public Call for the sale of the movable and immovable property left by Catalina Chenal, Widow Lentau. There were many persons present, but no bidders appeared, in testimony whereof I set this down as a matter of record. The above is attested to by Fernando Rodriguez. The second and third calls are made on April 23rd and May 4th, respectively, and in the same words, except that in the two latter instances, the Town Crier and not the Escribano gives the calls.



Pedro Bertoniére asks to have a day assigned for the Public Sale.      The Curator states that the time for making the Public Calls has passed, therefore he prays to have a day set aside for the auction sale of the Lentau estate. Alcalde de Kernion rules: Let the 9th of the current month be set aside as the day for holding the sale.

The Auction.      In the city of New Orleans, on May 9th, 1785, Alcalde Renato Huchet de Kernion, standing in the customary place to hold sales and auctions, in the presence of Perdo Bertoniére, Curator to the minors, Esteban and Antonio Lepine; Antonio Mendez, defender of the heirs of age; and the Escribano, for the purpose of selling the estate, the Public Crier began to call the sale, asking who will bid on the movables, Negroes and house; if anyone wishes to do so let him appear and his offer will be received, because this sale must be effected by 12 o'clock of this day, to the person offering the highest bid, under the following conditions, namely: Cash for the movables and a credit of one year for the Negroes and house, purchaser giving bond for the security of payment. At this stage Francisco Dubua appeared and bid 9 pesos 2 reales on 18 table napkins, some good, others bad, and this offer was accepted by His Honor and entered as..... 9 P. 2 R.

Luis Lambert bid 6 pesos on 7 tablecloths....	6	
Mrs. Touchaque bid 8 pesos on 5 sheets.....	8	
Josef Malies offered 44 pesos for a walnut armoire .....	44	
Luis Blac bid 1 peso 4 reales for a cypress table .....	1	4
Luis Lambert offered 6 pesos for 6 chairs....	6	
Josef Malire bid 30 pesos for 2 mattresses, one feather the other wool.....	30	
Widow Jacquelin offered 8 pesos for a mosquito bar .....	8	
Widow Jacquelin bid 25 pesos for a bed, complete with 1 wool, and 1 feather mattress and 1 Selesian linen mosquito bar.....	25	
Mr. Lambert offered 15 pesos for a mosquito bar .....	15	
A person named Pierry (Perry) bid 6 pesos 4 reales for 2 old woollen blankets.....	6	4
Mr. Malir bid 2 pesos on 1 mirror.....	2	
Simon Duriot (Durieur) bid 2 pesos 4 reales on 2 copper candlesticks.....	2	4
Luis Lambert offers 20 pesos for 4 silver covers .....	20	
Francisco Sanchez bid 5 pesos 6 reales on 2 pairs of iron tongs for the fireplace.....	5	6
Mr. Subie offered 3 pesos for 1 small cypress armoire .....	3	

Another made of cypress knocked down to him at 2 pesos.....	2	
Mr. Blac(he) bid 6 pesos 4 reales on an earthen jar .....	6	4
Francisco Sanchez bid 1 peso on a pair of chimney irons .....	1	
10 dishes, 5 pitchers, 1 soup tureen, 1 salad bowl, 4 cups, and 1 sugar bowl were knocked down to Mrs. Tauchek (Toujacques) at 7 pesos 4 reales .....	7	4
Mrs. Jacquelin bid 6 pesos for 30 bottles and 1 demijohn .....	6	
Mrs. Pore bid 2 pesos 4 reales for 1 large and 1 small tub.....	2	4
Luis Leblac bid 376 pesos for an infirm negress named Teresa, aged 55 years, a cook and a laundress .....	376	
There appeared (space left blank for the name) who bid 1000 pesos on the mulatress. Margarita Angelica, the price at which she was appraised, and at this stage the heirs suspended the sale, so that she would not be cried for higher bids, and that she be ceded to them at the price last offered, so that they might give her her freedom, the purchasers agreeing to pay the said 1000 pesos when convenient .....	1000	
Total.....	1566	

As there was nothing more to sell, His Honor suspended the proceedings to resume them when suitable. The final bidders obligated themselves to comply with the conditions of the sale. All who knew how to write signed with His Honor and the rest of the interested parties, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion; Luis Lambert; Fame (Femme) Toutcheque; Antonio Mendez; Pedro Bertoniére; before Fernando Rodriguez.

Sale of the house.

In the city of New Orleans, on May 11, 1785, Junior Alcalde René Huchet de Kernion went to Widow Lentau's house to auction it, in the presence of Pedro Bertoniére and Antonio Mendez. His Honor ordered the sale cried by the voice of the Public Crier, who called, whoever will bid on a lot of ground measuring 60 feet front by 120 deep, on Iberville Street, adjoined on one side by Widow Lione's place and on the other by Widow Dubernoir, upon which a house has been built, 40 feet front by different depths, said house constructed of bricks between wood, roofed with shingles, with brick chimneys, let him appear and his bid will be accepted, as the sale must be effected by 12 o'clock today, to

the person willing to pay the highest price, on terms of one year, with bond. At this stage, Luis Liotau appeared and offered 1000 pesos for the house; this was accepted by His Honor, who ordered it cried. Thomas Porre raised it to 1200, Alexandro Dupont bid 1500 pesos, Francisco Lioteau 1600, and Alexandro Dupont raised it to 1700 pesos. At that time the bell rang, and because it was midday, His Honor ordered the Crier to call this bid, which he did, saying: 1700 pesos has been offered for this house and lot; and since no one was willing to give more, he called for the first, second and third time, that this bid is good and valid, going, going, gone. This sale is made to the purchaser who obligates himself, with Francisco Birot, here present, who says he is his bondsman, both agreeing to comply with the conditions of the sale, and signing with His Honor and the interested parties, to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion; Alexandro Dupont; Birot; Antonio Mendez.

Antonio Mendez prays to have some one appointed to take charge of the funds. Antonio Mendez sets forth that it is convenient to the interests of his clients that it please the Court to name a depositary for the funds belonging to the succession, so that he may receive them, make collections and pay out whatever may be necessary in the course of these proceedings. Alcalde de Kernion orders this petition sent to Pedro Bertonière.

The Curator answers. Pedro Bertonière answers the foregoing, saying that considering Widow Jacquelin, one of the heirs, is a person having all the qualifications necessary to hold and administer the succession, he prays His Honor to name her guardian of the property and give her the power, necessary in law, to receive, pay and collect. The Court receives this petition and on May 14, 1785, decrees:

Decree. Considering that Widow Chaquelin (Jacquelin) has all the necessary qualifications to collect, and pay the debts for and against the Lenguetau estate, let her be named guardian of the property of this succession. She must be notified so that she may accept and take oath, His Honor hereby authorizing and giving her the power, necessary in law to enable her to institute any proceedings for this purpose. So His Honor provides, thus he decrees and signs, to which the Escribano attests.

Pedro Bertonière petitions for an Account and Sworn Statement. Pedro Bertonière avers that the sale of the property belonging to the deceased has been completed, therefore he prays it may please the Court to order Widow Jacquelin to produce the Account and Sworn Statement of the produce from the Lantau estate so that the legitimate share which belongs to each heir may be made evident. Alcalde de Kernion, on Juan del Postigo's advice, rules: As it is prayed.



Antonio Mendez prays for a taxation of the costs of the case.

Antonio Mendez states, in his petition, that by a decree of May 20th of this year, it has pleased the Court to order Mrs. Jacquelin, oldest daughter of the deceased, to present an Account and Sworn Statement of her mother's estate, and whereas she cannot draw up this statement without a taxation of the costs of the case, he prays Alcalde de Kernion to order Luis Lioteau to proceed with the taxation of same. René de Kernion, on Juan del Postigo's advice, rules: As it is prayed.

Notification, acceptation and oath.

In the city of New Orleans, on the said day, month and year (July 28, 1785), the Escribano personally notified Luis Lioteau, and he said that he accepted and did accept, and he swore by God and the Cross, according to law, etc., and he signed, to which the Escribano attests. Luis Lioteau failed to sign.

Taxation of Costs.

On July 28, 1785, Luis Lioteau taxes costs at 90 pesos 7½ reales.

Vouchers and accounting.

Widow Jacquelin presents 13 vouchers, namely:

No. 1. The bill for funeral expenses, which reads:

Statement for the interment and funeral of the late Mrs. Necteau, to-wit:

For interment .....	3	pesos	2	reales
For the assistance of one priest.....	1		4	
For 2 singers and 2 acolytes.....	2		3	
For the Cross and censer.....	1		4	
For the bells and sacristan.....	4			
For the pall.....	1			
For the black altar cloth.....	1			
For three masses for the soul of deceased .....	3			
For the grave.....	1		4	
For wax candles.....	3			
Total.....	22	pesos	1	reale

Paid. New Orleans, February 28, 1785. (Signed) Fr. Antonio de Sedella.

No. 2. February 27, 1785, The succession of Mme. Linto owes Durel, to-wit:

24 candles at 2½ reales..... 7 pesos 4 reales

Paid and received from Mrs. Widow Jacquelin, May 18, 1785. (Signed) Durel.

No. 3. Mrs. Linetaut owes 6 piastres and a half—6 piastres 4 reales—for treatment during illnesses, medicines, visits, etc., made and furnished to her house, from the 25th of last February, until the day of her death, and it also includes the remainder of an old, small account. New Orleans, May 2, 1785. Paid and received from Mrs. Widow Jacquelin. (Signed) Le Duc.

The following items are written across the back of the bill:

{1781 1782 1785}	In 1781, 4 escalins for the remainder of a final statement of accounts with Mrs. Linetaut..	4
------------------------	---	---

1782

May, 5 visits paid to Madame, twice to treat her ear	2
Visited a negress once.....	4

1785

February 26th, visited Madame 3 times that day for apoplexy. I do not count a visit made the same day for other reasons .....	4
Care of the feet of the same, twice.....	1
Portions prepared, etc. ....	1
February 27, 'Applied velticulari (?) to the same and paid 4 daily visits.....	2
February 28th, removed the velticulari (?).....	4

No. 4. A note, reading: I, Catherine Linsto, over my ordinary mark, in the presence of witnesses, acknowledge and promise to pay 30 pesos to the order of Mr. Cheval next February, for money that has been lent to me. New Orleans, June 27, 1784. Ordinary mark of Mrs. Catherine Senal. Witnesses, Pierre Perrots and Louis Lamothe. Paid by Mrs. Jaclin, May 16, 1785. (Signed) Cheval.

No. 5. Due from Mrs. Linguetau's succession from March 4, 1785:

1 coffin for Mrs. Linquetau.....	6 pesos
----------------------------------	---------

Received the above amount for which receipt is given, New Orleans, March 4, 1785. Jean Garmouche (Carmouche), Mrs. Traille acting for Jean Garmouche.

The heirs of Mrs. Linoto owe Bertrand:

2 black ribbons for pall.....	2	1 Real
-------------------------------	---	--------

Received from Mrs. Jacquelin 4 escalins. May 18, 1785. (Signed) Bertrand.

No. 6. I have received 6 piastres from Mrs. Bertran for carrying the body of the late Mrs. Linetau to the grave. (Signed) Giraud.

No. 7. I have received 2 piastres 4 escalins from Mrs. Jacquelin for 4 pairs of kid gloves that I have furnished for her mother's funeral. April 29, 1785. (Signed) Widow Cavelier.

No. 8. A note: I, Catherine Senal, widow Linsto, over my ordinary mark, in the presence of witnesses, promise to pay 2 piastres to the order of Widow Lionnois, next January, for a like sum she has lent me in my need. New Orleans, June 25, 1784. Ordinary mark of Catherine Senal, Widow Linsto. Witnesses, Guimberty and Pierre Perrot.

No. 9. Mrs. Lingtot owes Thomas Poree, as follows:

For 1 pair of shoes ..... 1 peso

" 1. carcass (dressed fowl?) 1 " 1 real

Received payment from Mrs. Jacquelin, June 6, 1785.  
(Signed) Thomas Poree.

No. 10. I pray Mrs. Jaclant (Jacquelin) to remit 2 piastres by my negress for milk for which I have her notes (Milk Tickets). May 1, 1785. (Signed) Ph. Saulet.

No. 11. I have received 3 piastres from Mrs. for making 2 mattresses for the late Mrs. Linetot. (Signed) Widow Meilleur.

No. 12. I have received 2 cords of wood from Mr. Andre. February 24, 1785. (Signed) Widow Linetos.

I, the undersigned, declare to have received from Mrs. Jacquelin the sum mentioned here above, namely 8 piastres. Received payment, New Orleans, May 6, 1785. (Signed) Andre Chiloe Lassalle.

No. 13. I acknowledge to have received 2 piastres 4 escalins from Mrs. Jacquelin for 1 pair of slippers for which Mrs. Linetot owed me. June 4, 1785. (Signed) Francoise Monplaisir.

I have received, besides, 5 piastres 5 escalins from Mrs. Jacquelin, for 1 demijohn of wine, this 4th day of June, 1785. (Signed) Francoise Monplaisir.

*Account and Sworn Statement.* The Account and Sworn Statement presented by Maria Francisca Lepine, Widow Chaquelen (Jackquelin), guardian of the estate left by her late mother, Catalina Chenal, Widow Lento, for which she was named administratrix, and as such she has been ordered to render, which she does in the following manner:

#### *Assets*

Firstly, she credits the sum of 1566 pesos, the amount realized on the sale of the movables, the negress Teresa, and the mulattress, Margarita, as appears from the proceedings running from page 30 to page 34 inclusive..... 1566

She also credits 1700 pesos, the selling price of the house ..... 1700

She further credits 168 pesos, the value of the clothes the deceased left her, adjudicated to her at that price ..... 168



She enters Leonardo Mazange's note for 900 pesos, in favor of the deceased, dated November 1, 1784 .....	900	
Another note in the name of Antonio Lepine, for 50 pesos, dated July 2, 1784 .....	50	
A note signed by Pedro Tardela, for 8 pesos, dated August 22, 1758.....	8	
A note signed by Luis Lambert for 660 pesos, in favor of the deceased, dated April 6, 1784 .....	660	
Mrs. Pertuit's note for 10 pesos, dated October 6, 1781 .....	10	
A note signed by Mariana Bergeron, Widow Bienvenu, for 1328 pesos, 2 reales, dated October 20, 1784 .....	1328	2
Francisco Pertuit's note for 209 pesos, dated January 3, 1781 .....	209	
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>6599</b>	<b>2</b>

*Liabilities*

Firstly, she enters 22 pesos 1 real for funeral expenses, Voucher No. 1.....	22	1
She enters a debt of 2 pesos 4 reales for rel, for candles, as appears from his receipt, No. 2 .....	7	4
8 pesos 4 reales paid to Mr. (Dr.) Le Duc for medicines according to his bill, No. 3 .....	6	4
30 pesos paid to Mr. Chebal (Cheval) as appears from his receipt, No. 4 .....	30	
6 pesos for the coffin and ribbons, according to receipt, No. 5 .....	6	
She enters a debt of 2 pesos 4 reales for gloves, as appears from receipt, No. 7 .....	2	4
She further enters 10 pesos paid to Mrs. Lionnais, as may be proven from her receipt, No. 8 .....	10	
She also enters 9 reales paid to Mr. Poree, according to his receipt, No. 9 .....	1	1
She further enters 2 pesos paid to Mr. Saulet, as per receipt, No. 10 .....	2	
She likewise enters 3 pesos 4 reales paid to Mrs. Milloe (Meillieur), as appears from receipt, No. 11, for making 2 mattresses for the succession .....	3	4
She further enters 8 pesos paid to Andres Chiloc, according to his receipt, No. 12 .....	8	
7 pesos 4 reales paid to Mrs. Monplaisir, as appears from her receipt, No. 13 .....	7	4

Entered 2 pesos 4 reales paid to Mr. Bachin, according to his bill, No. 14 (Not included in the vouchers) .....

2 4

She also enters 90 pesos  $7\frac{1}{2}$  reales paid as the costs of the Court .....

90  $7\frac{1}{2}$

She likewise enters 15 pesos paid to the person who has drawn up the inventory proceedings, sale and this present accounting .....

15

Total..... 221  $1\frac{1}{2}$

#### *Recapitulation*

Assets ..... 6599 2

Charges and deductions .... 221  $1\frac{1}{2}$

Liquid Balance ..... 6378  $0\frac{1}{2}$

Mrs. Jacquelin swears by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, according to law, that this accounting has been made well and faithfully and that it is correct. She signs it in New Orleans, August 2, 1785. (This accounting is unsigned.)

The Guardian of the estate petitions to present the above accounting.

Maria Francisca Lepine, Widow Chaquelin avers that she has been ordered to give an Account and

Sworn Statement, as guardian of her late mother's estate, therefore she duly presents the above and prays the Court to approve it and to condemn the other interested parties to abide by it. René Huchet de Kernion rules to send this petition and accounting to Antonio Mendez.

Antonio Mendez contests Mrs. Jacquelin's accounting.

On August 6, 1785, Antonio Mendez contests the Account and Sworn Statement presented by

Widow Jacquelin, as guardian of the property left by her late mother, Catalina Chenal, Widow Iento:

#### *Assets*

Firstly, he enters the 1566 pesos realized on the sale of the movables, etc. .... 1566

The selling price of the house..... 1700

The appraisement of the clothes..... 168

Mr. Mazange's note ..... 900

Antonio Lepine's note ..... 50

Pedro Tardela's note ..... 8

Luis Lambert's debt to the succession..... 660

Mrs. Pertuit's note ..... 10

Mrs. Maria Bergeron Bienvenu's note..... 1328 2

Mr. Pertuit's note ..... 209

Total..... 6599 2

*Liabilities*

He enters the amounts accounted for by the 14 vouchers, Costs of the Court, together with Mrs. Jacquelin's bill for 15 pesos paid for drawing up the inventory, sale and Sworn Statement, amounting to 221 pesos 1½ reales, to which he adds 15 pesos, paid to the person Antonio Mendez has employed to contest Mrs. Jacquelin's accounting, and for the examination and registration of all the documents filed in this proceeding in accordance with his appointment as defender of the absent heirs of age. The total of the debt amounts to .....

236 1½

*Recapitulation*

Assets .....	6599	2
Charges and deductions ....	236	1½
Liquid Balance .....	6363	-1½

Antonio Mendez swears by God and a Sign of the Holy Cross that this account has been made well and faithfully, save error of the pen, or omissions. New Orleans, August 6, 1785. (Signed) Antonio Mendez.

Antonio Mendez prays to present his contestation.

Antonio Mendez alleges that he has examined the accounting presented by Mrs. Jacquelin and finds

that it has been made justly and correctly, therefore he offers no objections to it, and submits his own contestation of same. Alcalde de Kernion rules to send this petition and contestation to Pedro Bertoniére, Curator of the minor children of Widow Languetau.

Pedro Bertoniére presents his contestation of Mrs. Jacquelin's accounting.

Contestation of the Account and Sworn Statement presented by Mrs. Jacquelin, as guardian of her

mother's estate:

He enters the same assets as Mrs. Jacquelin, amounting to ..... 6599 2

The liabilities are the same as the disbursements accounted for by the 14 vouchers, plus the Costs of Court, 15 pesos paid for clerical services rendered in drawing up Mrs. Jacquelin's Sworn Statement, and 15 pesos for a like reason entered by Antonio Mendez, which brings the debit up to 236 pesos 1½ reales. To this amount Pedro Bertoniére adds another 15 pesos for the same reason, namely: Drawing up this contestation, examining the documents, and verification of the inventory and sale. These liabilities amount to..

251 1½



*Recapitulation*

Assets .....	6599	2
Charges and deductions.....	251	1½
	<hr/>	
Liquid Balance .....	6348	-½

Pedro Bertoniére swears by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross that this contestation has been made well and faithfully, save error of the pen, or omission. (Signed) Pedro Bertoniére.

Pedro Bertoniére petitions to present his contestation.

Pedro Bertoniére sets forth that he duly submits his contestation and prays the Court to accept it as presented and to order the other interested parties to abide by it. Alcalde de Kernion, on Juan del Postigo's advice, receives the above and later decrees:

Decree.

In the city of New Orleans, on August 29, 1785, Alcalde de Kernion, having examined these proceedings, said: That he approves and does approve the accounting presented by Widow Chaquelin, guardian of her mother's estate, and the contestation made of same, and considering that the parties have agreed to abide by it, therefore for its greater validation, he interposes his authority and judicial decree as he can and must by law, for this is his decree, thus he has ordered and signed. Fees 3 pesos. Received. (Signed) René Huchet de Kernion; Licenciado Postigo.

Mrs. Jacquelin petitions for a taxation of the last costs.

On February 17, 1786, Maria Francisca Lepine, Widow Jacquelin, states that the proceedings for an accounting have been finished, therefore she prays to have them sent to the Judicial Accountant so that a partition of the estate may be made. Alcalde Dufossat, into whose Court the case has passed, on Assessor Postigo's advice, rules: As it is prayed.

Taxation of last costs.

2 reales.

On February 20, 1786, Luis Lioteau taxes the last costs at 9 pesos

Partition.

In the city of New Orleans, on February 20, 1786, Luis Lioteau, Judicial Accountant, in virtue of the foregoing decree, made a partition of the estate left by Catalina Chenal, Widow Lineteau, among her six children, namely: Catalina Lepine, Widow Lambert; Naneta Lepine, wife of one called Toutchaque; Angelica Lepine, wife of Francisco Pertuit; Francisca Lepine, Widow Jacquelin; Antonio Lepine; and Santiago Lepine, deceased, represented by his four children; and having seen and examined the inventory, account and Sworn Statement, and contestations of same and all other documents with bearing on the case, he has

proceeded to make the partition and division in the following manner:

*Body of the Estate*

He enters in the body of the estate the 1566 pesos, the full amount realized on the movables and slaves..... 1566

The selling price of the house..... 1700

He further enters all the items contained in the Account and Sworn Statement and two contestations, bringing the Body of the Estate up to 6599 pesos 2 reales.

And for the liquidation of the divisible estate the following amounts must be deducted from it:

He here enters the full amount paid out according to the 14 vouchers, namely.....	206-1-1/2
Costs of the Court.....	90-7-1/2
Fees for Mrs. Jacquelin's accounting.....	15-
Fees for Antonio Mendez' accounting.....	15-
Fees for Mr. Bertoniere's accounting.....	15-
Last costs of the Court.....	9-3

Total.....	351-4
------------	-------

*Resumen*

The full amount of the body of the estate.....	6599-2
--	--------

The full amount to be deducted.....	351-4
-------------------------------------	-------

Which reduces the capital of the estate to 6247-pesos 6 reales, which will be divided among the six heirs.....

6247-6

To-wit:

To Catalina Lepine, Widow Lambert, for the one-sixth part that should go to her.....	1041-2-11
--	-----------

To Naneta Lepine, wife of Mr. Touchaque.....	1041-2-11
--	-----------

To Angelica Lepine, wife of Francisco Pertuit....	1041-2-11
---	-----------

To Francisca Lepine, Widow Jacquelin.....	1041-2-11
---	-----------

To Antonio Lepine.....	1041-2-11
------------------------	-----------

To Santiago Lepine, deceased, represented by his 4 children .....	1041-2-11
---	-----------

These six parts amount in all to.....	6247-6
---------------------------------------	--------

In this manner the Judicial Accountant closed the division of the estate and certifies that he has made it well and faithfully according to his legal knowledge and understanding, and he signed. Dated as above. (Signed) Luis Lioteau.

*Note*

As it appears from these proceedings, that each one of the heirs has received, or owes, this succession, they will have to

give an account of their respective debts to the guardian of the estate who must deduct from the part that belongs to each one of them the amount already received, or that is due, according to his receipt, or obligation. Dated as above.

Luis Lioteau petitions for payment of his fees. On March 16, 1786, Luis Lioteau petitions, setting forth that in his capacity, as Judicial Accountant,

he has drawn up the partition of the Lineteau estate, therefore he prays the Court to order the fees for his labors adjusted by the present Escribano, and that he be paid, without delay, by the guardian of the estate. Alcalde Dufossat, on Juan del Postigo's advice, rules: As it is prayed.

[Translator's Note:—Nothing further is done, so it may be supposed that Mrs. Jacquelin paid the Accountant's fees.—L. L. P.]

March 10.

**Josef Monagut (Montegut)  
vs. Pedro Guerrero,  
to collect a debt from  
the succession of  
Juan Vencet (Vincent).**

No. 3078. 11 pp.

Courts of Alcaldes  
Forstall and Orue.

Assessor, Juan del Postigo.

Escribano, Fernando  
Rodriguez.

The plaintiff presents a bill for 61 pesos which reads in detail:

Pedro Guerrero owes to auction sale of the estate of the late Juan Vincent, as follows:

2 barrels of salt.....	10 - 4
13 night vessels.....	7 -
25 jars.....	6 - 2
25 jars.....	10 - 2
15 Silesia handkerchiefs .....	18 -
For 1 jeweled ornament .....	5 - 4
Another, the same.....	3 - 4

Total..... 61 - 0

(Signed) Jh. Montegut.

This suit to collect a debt due to a succession contains no unusual features. After proof of the debt, the Court issued a Writ of Execution against the property of the defendant, but when the Writ was served by the Deputy Sheriff, he found no property to seize; and the defendant escaped when an attempt was made to take him prisoner. The items listed in the bill that evidences the debt have some interest to the student of social and economic history.

The plaintiff petitions to have this bill verified.

Joseph Montegut, empowered by Feliciano Delille, Testamentary Executor of the late Juan Vincent, petitions, saying that as it appears from the bill, duly presented, Pedro Guerrero owes the succession 61 pesos. Several



attempts have been made to collect this debt, but without success up to the present. Therefore he prays the Court to order the Escribano to certify whether it is not true that the items mentioned in the said bill were not adjudicated to him in the presence of and with the assistance of Francisco Maria (de Reggio), then Alcalde.

In a secondary petition, he states that Pedro Guerrero is a soldier in the Fixed Regiment of this Place, therefore he prays the Court to order this instance prosecuted before His Lordship because it is of his cognizance. (Signed) Jh. Montegut. Alcalde Forstall, on Juan del Postigo's advice, rules: As it is prayed.

Fernando Rodriguez certifies that the bill is correct.

In virtue of the foregoing decree, and upon examining the obligations of the sale of the property left by Juan Vincent, I certify and attest that all the entries contained in the bill presented by Josef Montegut are in conformity to and agree with the same proceedings, to which I refer. New Orleans, March 12, 1785. Fees 15 reales. (Signed) Fernando Rodriguez.

Josef Montegut prays for a Writ of Execution.

Josef Montegut sets forth that, as it appears from the certification duly presented by the Escribano, the defendant owes the Vincent succession the amount stipulated, therefore he prays the Court to order a Writ of Execution issued in the customary way, against his person and estate, sufficient to satisfy the debt, its one-tenth and costs. Alcalde Forstall accepts this petition and on April 11, 1785 decrees:

Decree.

Whereas: Issue a Writ of Execution against the person and estate of Pedro Guerrero for the sum of 61 pesos, which is due the Juan Vincent succession, together with its one-tenth and costs, caused or to be caused. Fees 2 pesos. (Signed) Forstall; Licenciado Postigo.

Note.

A marginal note specifies that the Writ of Execution which was ordered has been issued and delivered to the Deputy Sheriff. (Signed) Rodriguez.

Taxation of Costs.

7 pesos.

On October 19, 1785, Luis Liotreau taxes the costs of the case at

The plaintiff prays to have the Writ of Execution carried into effect.

On February 7, 1786, Josef Montegut petitions Alcalde Orue, into whose Court the case has passed, saying: That a Writ of Execution has been issued against the defendant's estate, and although it was delivered to Nicolas Fromentin quite some time ago, it has not been served and carried into effect. Therefore he prays that the said Fromentin be ordered to comply with the contents of the writ within a short

space of time. Alcalde Orue, on Juan del Postigo's advice, rules: Notify the Deputy Sheriff to comply with what has been ordered, with a warning that the said writ must be carried into effect within 24 hours.

*Writ of Execution.*

Let the Sheriff of this city, or in his place the Deputy Sheriff, request Pedro Guerrero to pay Josef Montegut, Testamentary Executor of the late Juan Vincent, immediately, and if he does not do so, take execution against his person and property sufficient to satisfy the said sum, which must be placed in the Public Depository, at the disposition of this Court, in accordance with the decree rendered, dated this day. Thus it has been ordered. New Orleans, April 11, 1785. (Signed) Forstall. By Order of His Honor. (Signed) Fernando Rodriguez, Notary Public.

*Report of the service of the Writ.*

In the city of New Orleans, on February 7, 1786, before the Escribano, appeared Nicolas Fromentin, Deputy Sheriff, who said that in virtue of the Writ on the reverse side of this page, he requested Pedro Guerrero to pay Josef Montegut the sum of 61 pesos immediately; this he did not do, nor was anything pointed out to him to be seized, and he attempted to make him a prisoner, but he escaped. In testimony whereof he sets this down as a matter of record, and he signed (unsigned), to which the Escribano attests. (Signed) Fernando Rodriguez, Clerk of the Court.

*Fernando Rodriguez prays for a taxation of the last costs of the case.*

Fernando Rodriguez, Clerk of the Court, declares that Josef Montegut, as empowered by Felician Delille, Testamentary Executor of the late Juan Vincent, in a suit that has been prosecuted before him against Pedro Guerrero to collect a debt, in virtue of which he prays the Court to order the last taxation of the costs, caused or to be caused, and that same be paid from the funds of the succession. The Alcalde rules: As it is prayed. Let the taxation be made by Luis Lioteau, after he has accepted and taken oath, and let same be paid from the funds of the succession. (Unsigned.)

*Notification, acceptation and oath.*

On the said day, month and year, the Escribano notified Luis Lioteau, Public Taxer, of the foregoing decree, and he said that he accepted and did accept, and he swore by God, Our Lord, and a Sign of the Cross, in conformity to law, to execute, well and faithfully, the taxation he has been ordered to make, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests.

**Taxation of Costs.**

**March 30.**

**Proceedings brought by  
Juan Bautista Labatut & Co.,  
to sell a boat, the  
"Catalina."**

**No. 61. 6 pp.**

**Court of Acting Intendent  
Juan Ventura Morales.**

**No Assessor.**

**Escribano, Rafael Perdomo.**

This proceeding brought to secure permission to sell a ship follows the usual procedure in such cases. Proof of ownership of the vessel is established by the owners. But as the case stands here it is unfinished.

have seen and examined in the Bay of this Port, where it now rides at anchor. This sale is made for the sum of 21,000 livres that the said Dolhonde obligates himself and his partner, Mr. Labatut, to pay in solidum, one for the other, under the renunciations, exceptions and benefits of the law which requires them to pay the vendor within three months from this day, under penalty for all prejudices, losses and interests, and for payment of which he especially mortgages the said schooner and its equipment, without one obligation being derogatory to the other, and his present and future estate, together with that of his partner, Labatut; in virtue of which the vendor withdraws from all rights to ownership that he has in the schooner and cedes them to the said Dolhonde and Labatut, the possession of same which the former acknowledges to have received under the agreement among the parties, and for its execution they obligate and mortgage all their present and future property, and the said Dolhonde elects the city of New Orleans as his domicile, and the said vendor, the city of Cap (Francais), in which places, nevertheless, they promise, etc., obligate themselves, etc., and renounce, etc.

Done and authorized in Cap in the (Notaries') office, on the morning of January 13th of the year 1785. Mr. Dolhonde signed, but Mr. Baupin declared he did not know how to write. This act was read to them by the said Notaries, in conformity

On July 14, 1785, Luis Lioteau taxes costs at 4 pesos 7 reales.

The first entry is a certified copy of an Act of Sale, written in French and later translated into Spanish, which reads, in part:

Before the Notaries Royal of Cap Francais, Island and Coast of Santo Domingo, undersigned, were present: Lorenzo Baupin, Captain of a schooner, resident of this Pier of San Luis, Parish of Our Lady of the Assumption, who by these presents sells, cedes and transfers to Juan Dolhonde, Captain of a ship, usually a resident of Louisiana, and now in this city, here present at the execution of this act, whereby he buys for himself and Juan Labatut, his partner, a schooner of about 40 tons, named the "Catherine," with all its equipment, and its boat, as is today, that the purchaser declares to



to ordinance, the original remaining in the possession of Dubrulle, one of the Notaries. (Signed) Grimperet; Dubrulle. Colated with the original and a second copy.

Juan B. Labatut & Co. petition to sell a schooner. Juan Bautista Labatut, San Martin & Co. petition, averring that, as it may be noted from the

document duly presented, they are the owners of a schooner, the "Cathalina," of 40 tons and that it is convenient to them to sell it in the same condition that it now is, together with all utensils and equipment, therefore they pray that it may please the Court to grant them the necessary permit to do so in order that the Escribano may proceed to execute the sale, and they will promptly transfer the said schooner to Carlos de La Chiapela, a resident of this city, for the price mentioned in the said act, under the conditions stipulated therein. They further pray the Court that, having presented the Act of Sale (executed in Cap), it may please the Intendant to decree as they have prayed. (Signed) Pro. San Martin, Juan Labatut, San Martin & Co.; Jn. Dolhonde.

Decree.

Juan Ventura Morales decrees: The document to which the petitioner refers having been presented, let it be translated into the Castilian language by Juan Josef Duforest, who must be notified for his acceptation and oath, and done, if the result conforms to what he represents, let the corresponding written act of sale be drawn up by the present Escribano, as requested. (Signed) Morales, whose title reads: Accountant, ad interim, for the Royal Treasury and in charge of the Intendancy General of this Province, in the absence of Martin Navarro.

Notification, acceptation and oath.

On the said day, month and year (March 30, 1785), the Escribano personally notified Juan Josef Duforest, Public Interpreter, and he said that he accepted and did accept, and he swore by God and the Cross, according to law, to proceed well and faithfully with the translation he has been ordered to make, and he signed, to which the Escribano attests.

The Translation.

This is followed by Duforest's translation of the certified copy of the French Act of sale which begins this proceeding.

[Translator's Note:—Nothing further is done in the matter so it may be supposed that the Court's orders were carried out and that Rafael Perdomo executed the necessary act of sale transferring the schooner "Catalina" from Messrs. Labatut, San Martin & Dolhonde to Carlos de La Chiapela, which may be found among the Perdomo original Acts in the Notarial Archives at the Court Building, and that for some unexplained reason, or through negligence, he failed to file a copy with these proceedings.—L. L. P.]

(To be continued)